

DETERMINING SOCIAL (IN)JUSTICE:
ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION MAKING AND
THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

By

Shelby Bierwagen

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Sociology - Master of Arts

2015

ABSTRACT

DETERMINING SOCIAL (IN)JUSTICE: ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION MAKING AND THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

By

Shelby Bierwagen

This study focuses on organizations that address the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) and the likelihood of placing an emphasis on CSEC as important in relation to the organizations' perceived influences on caseloads and the consistencies/inconsistencies with literature in this area. Statistical modeling using logistic regression, comparisons with the literature, and changeable/non-changeable influences on CSEC based on a small wins orientation are used to explore this area. The theoretical and conceptual framework is drawn from the CSEC research and the organizational priority setting literature. To study organizations, data from Estes and Weiner's (2003) investigation into CSEC are analyzed, as it draws attention to not only the victims of sexual exploitation but also to the organizations themselves and how they perceive their CSEC caseload. While half of the organizations included in this analysis provide training on CSEC, very few possess a working definition of or manual on handling CSEC cases. The significance of providing training is maintained throughout all analyses, though a pattern cannot be established along theoretical lines with regards to reporting certain variables as influencing the number of CSEC cases the organization receives and the likelihood of reporting an emphasis on CSEC. An alternative explanation that focuses on a different aspect of organizational priority setting is proposed that may account for these findings.

Copyright by
SHELBY BIERWAGEN
2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
PROBLEM STATEMENT & THEORETICAL APPROACH	1
<i>The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children</i>	1
<i>Organizational Priority Setting</i>	8
METHODS	17
<i>Measures</i>	18
<i>Emphasis on CSEC as important</i>	18
<i>Influence variables</i>	19
<i>Preparation variables</i>	19
<i>Mediators</i>	20
RESULTS	21
DISCUSSION	25
CONCLUSION	32
APPENDIX	34
REFERENCES	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	21
Table 2. Cross-Tabulations of Emphasis on CSEC	22
Table 3. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC on Various Factors from Binary Logistic Regression	22
Table 4. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC	24
Table 5. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC on Various Factors from Progressive Adjustment	24

PROBLEM STATEMENT & THEORETICAL APPROACH

The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children

Human trafficking tends to be equated with the commercial sexual exploitation of children. Discussions of this sort overly simplify the breadth of human trafficking. The commercial sexual exploitation of children (hereafter referred to as CSEC) is generally regarded as a broad category of sexual exploitation of minors in which profit can either be monetary or non-monetary and includes the acts of trafficking, prostitution, pornography, and sex tourism (Bolling and Harper 2007; Scarpa 2006), although the categories of acts included in definitions vary. Commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) is differentiated from sexual abuse by the addition of a pecuniary or other economically related exchange. Most definitions of CSEC intentionally differentiate between sex trafficking and prostitution, pornography, and other forms of sexual exploitation. While exact definitions may be necessary in terms of prosecution, as a general understanding of what constitutes CSEC, the definition put forth in The Declaration and Agenda for Action for the World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children may be more practical as a starting point:

The commercial sexual exploitation of children is a fundamental violation of children's rights. It comprises sexual abuse by the adult and remuneration in cash or kind to the child or a third person or persons. The child is treated as a sexual object and as a commercial object. The commercial sexual exploitation of children constitutes a form of coercion and violence against children, and amounts to forced labour and a contemporary form of slavery (Chase and Statham 2004: 24).

The primary investigators of the data used in this study define CSEC as an economic (monetary or non-monetary) exchange of sexual exploitation of children that includes pornography, prostitution, and trafficking (Estes and Weiner 2001). Due to the conflation of CSEC with human trafficking and the separation in the general CSEC literature of trafficking,

prostitution, and pornography, the relationship between CSEC and human trafficking needs to be delineated.

Included in the Palermo Protocols (adopted by the United Nations in 2000 as a supplement to the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime) is the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children. Also included are protocols relating to human smuggling and firearms manufacturing. These protocols are considered the international standards in defining and combating these three types of organized crime. Human trafficking is defined in Article 3, paragraph (a) of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons as

the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring 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 (UNODC 2000).

In the United States, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 is the national standard on the government's human trafficking efforts, both domestically and in foreign efforts. The law is divided into three primary components that address issues of protection, prosecution, and prevention, defining human trafficking as "the act of recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing, or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud, or coercion" (TVPA 2000). Broadly stated, human trafficking consists of the use of force, fraud, or coercion in the exploitation of individuals. In regards to prosecution, the act, the means, and the purpose of exploitation must be demonstrated. Sex trafficking (e.g. commercial sex and sexual tourism) and labor trafficking (e.g. forced labor and domestic servitude) tend to be the forms of human trafficking that receive the most attention,

yet human trafficking also includes, but is not limited to, child soldiers, debt bondage, and trafficking in organs.

CSEC is a type of human trafficking in that it is a component of sex trafficking. It is not the same as child sex abuse that does not involve commercial exploitation (i.e. profit) and is distinct from trafficking that involves adults. The TVPA (2000) designates all minors subject to any form of commercial sex activity as victims of a severe form of human trafficking, in that those under the age of eighteen need not be forced, coerced, or fraudulently persuaded into sexual exploitation to be considered victims of sex trafficking. ‘Commercial sex act’ defined as “any sex act on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person” (TVPA 2000: sec. 103(3)). Thus, all CSEC is considered human trafficking due to a) the children are exploited for economic (monetary or non-monetary) gain, and b) legally, minors cannot consent to sexual acts (which includes, but is not limited to, sex and pornography).

Estimates of the rates of CSEC are frequently reported, but their reliability is often questioned. These range from 100,000 to three million in the United States alone (Mitchell, Jones, Finkelhor, and Wolak 2011), yet these estimates contain significant limitations, flawed methodologies, and inconsistent definitions (Melrose, Barnett, and Brodie 1999; Weitzer 2014). A legislative standpoint may help to shed some light on the extent of the issue. International legislation and several global conferences pertaining specifically to CSEC or one of its components have been ratified or convened in the recent past, such as The First World Congress on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, the Second World Congress on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the international campaign End Child Prostitution in Asia Tourism, and the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, which includes the Protocol to Prevent,

Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. In the United States, the 2003 and 2005 reauthorizations of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act added specific provisions for prosecution of human trafficking cases. The 2008 William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act removed the burden of proof from the prosecution of the offender being aware of the child's minor status. Other domestic legislation and efforts have included the Child Pornography Prevention Act, the joint FBI, Department of Justice Child Exploitation and Obscenity section, and National Center for Missing and Exploited Children Innocence Lost Initiative, and state-based Safe Harbor laws (laws that decriminalize juvenile prostitution, classify those under eighteen as exploited children, and allow judges to defer prosecution by referring the youth to social services, such as short-term housing or crisis intervention (Cedeño 2012)).

This vast legislation, of which only a minute sample has been listed, demonstrates that the commercial sexual exploitation is an accepted social problem at least in political arenas. Little can be done to combat social problems until the causes, intricacies, and factors that drive and/or promote victimization are understood. Literature on the topic has pointed to several factors that are prominent among CSEC victims. The link between a child's home life, such as experiencing neglect, excessive arguing, sexual abuse or assault, and risk for victimization has been well established (Fong and Cardoso 2010; Pearce, Williams, and Galvin 2003; Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015). Runaway, homeless, or throwaway youth (Fong and Cardoso 2010; Walker-Rodriguez and Hill 2011; Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015) and being female (Boxill and Richardson 2007; Estes and Weiner 2002), particularly with internet-facilitated crimes (Mitchell, Jones, Finkelhor and Wolak 2011), are also at increased risk. Drug use has

been linked to CSEC, although the directionality is debated (Cobbina and Oselin 2011; Chase and Statham 2005; Reid and Piquero 2014).

The social sphere of poverty can serve as a demonstration of the interconnectedness of factors that spur CSEC. The link between socioeconomic status, poverty, and CSEC has been well established at both the individual and community-level (Chase and Statham 2005; Pearce et al. 2003; Clawson et al. 2009; Estes & Weiner 2005). Some youth engage in “survival sex” to provide for their basic needs, such as food and shelter (Melrose et al. 1999; Finkelhor and Ormrod 2004), while others attempt to provide themselves with or maintain a lifestyle that is otherwise unavailable to them (Taylor-Browne 2002). Other children that engage in prostitution come from middle class families, but resort to prostitution when they are living on the streets (Greene, Ennett, and Ringwalt 1999; Hunnicutt 2001), further demonstrating the link between homelessness and CSEC. Areas of high crime, which tend to coincide with poverty, are also seen to have higher levels of CESC (Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015; Clawson et al. 2009; Estes and Weiner 2005).

At the macro-level, several community-level factors have been found to influence the existence of CSEC. Such factors include a large population of transient males, such as military personnel or truckers (Clawson et al. 2009; Estes and Weiner 2005; Moon 1997), the presence of an adult prostitution market (Clawson et al. 2009; Estes and Weiner 2005; Farley and Kelly 2000; Hofstede 1999), and countries with political or social upheaval or police or political corruption (Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015; Clawson et al. 2009). The presence of public places that children and youth frequent, such as movie theaters, bus stops, and shopping malls, have been identified as locations that exploiters force or kidnap victims (Boxhill and

Richardson 2007). Relaxed legal enforcement is also connected to CSEC (Gutierrez 1998; Hodgson 1995) and will be discussed in more detail below.

Other factors that influence CSEC and make addressing the issue difficult are also worth mentioning. First, lesbian, gay, transgender, or questioning youth are especially at risk of exploitation (Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015), yet this is a population which is typically underserved by youth services, victim service providers, and society. Second, there has been a history of treating CSEC victims as juvenile delinquents and criminalizing their behavior, be this due to difficulties in identifying an exploiter or misunderstandings or ignorance of the extent of the situation (e.g. Boxhill and Richardson 2007; Reid and Jones 2011; Chase and Statham 2005) Third, as with situations of intimate partner and domestic violence, CSEC victims may be intimately connected to their exploiter, such as through a romantic or familial relationship, complicating identification and victim cooperation (Greenbaum and Crawford-Jakubiak 2015).

Returning to the role of law enforcement, part of the issue of legal enforcement of CSEC laws, prosecution of offenders, and identification of victims is due to the broader issue of awareness. For example, Grace and colleagues (2012) discussed the unique role that school nurses have in identifying CSEC victims and the need for increased training and awareness among this population. Farrell and Pfeffer (2014) found that law enforcement may be unaware of and lack training on human trafficking. There also tended to be a lack of policy, such as to what unit trafficking cases should be sent, differences in identifications between police and victim service providers, and the fact that patrol officers and first responders, who are more likely to encounter victims, are not as well trained in this area due to budget shortfalls.

While Farrel and Pfeffer's (2014) study focused specifically on human trafficking, which is only one component of CSEC, their observations are still of interest. Specifically, the authors state that, "[i]f people from the community don't think trafficking is a problem, then the police are not going to make it a priority" (50), as well as, "[t]he use of reactive strategies to identify cases is rooted in a lack of prioritization of human trafficking within local agencies and their communities" (54), with detectives believing there was little they could do to proactively combat trafficking. Turning to the focus of this study, one reason an organization may make an issue a priority and decide to engage in combating an injustice, CSEC in this case, is due to the issue becoming a social problem. The presence of a social injustice or the violation of a human right is not sufficient for an issue to be labeled a social problem. Typically, an issue becomes a social problem when it is defined as such by the public (Kohn 1976; Merton 1971; Spector and Kitsuse 2001). However, public consensus of an issue as undesirable is not necessarily guided by the same perspectives that are used to explain the issue and its conditions (Lauer 1976). Some organizations are able to turn their issues into social problems by gaining public awareness through media coverage, but others will decide to take on an issue *because it has been deemed a social problem*. In the constructionist approach to social problems, pioneered by Spector and Kitsuse (2001), perceptions of a social problem are essential. While previous researchers had focused on the objective conditions surrounding the emergence of a social problem, Spector and Kitsuse argued for the necessity of examining claims-makers and their claims-making activities. The objective social conditions themselves are not of interest. The conceptualization of a social problem comes about via claims that do not necessarily reflect reality except that of the vested interests of the claims-makers. It is a collective perception that arises via human interaction through power and the mobilization of resources that dictates whether an issue is deemed a social

problem. Whether CSEC is considered an *a priori* or *a posteriori* social problem is beyond the scope of this paper. What will be discussed is whether an organization has determined CSEC to be important enough to make it a priority in their policies, and if they have determined that the underlying factors that support CSEC in the literature are the ones they should also be focusing on. How such decisions are made is where I turn next.

Organizational Priority Setting

The literature on organizational decision making has focused primarily on healthcare priority settings (the terms decision making and priority setting tend to be used interchangeably, and will be used as such throughout this paper), in which the “accountability for reasonableness” (A4R) (Daniels and Sabin 1997; Daniels and Sabin 2002) framework has become dominant. The A4R model highlights elements of decision making that are utilized in regards to applying new technologies in health care. Four conditions must be met for priority setting to be a fair process: Relevance (rationale based on evidential and principle reasons); Publicity (rationale and decisions on priority setting are publicly accessible); Appeals (opportunities for challenge and revision of decisions to accommodate stakeholder concerns); and Enforcement (voluntary or public regulation of priority setting process). As an operationalization of the relevance component of the A4R model in regards to clinical service priority setting, Gibson, Martin, and Singer (2004) identified eight priority setting criteria: Strategic fit (fit with organizational vision/goals); Alignment with external directives (alignment with government mandates and legislation); Academic commitments (advancing education and research); Clinical impact (ensuring competency/effectiveness); Community needs (current and future community demand); Partnerships (external agreements/commitments); Interdependency (internal cooperation); and Resource implications (mobilization and use of resources).

Even though the A4R model was developed for a healthcare setting, its grounding in justice theories and emphasis on democratic deliberation (Cohen 1994; Rawls 1993) suggests its applicability in multiple settings. Significant parallels exist between healthcare and social justice/criminal justice priority setting (the term social justice will be used throughout, as some of the organizations that are included solely focus on a criminal justice framework and others more broadly on human welfare). In the healthcare setting, when limited resources are available in which to invest in new technologies, a fair decision making process is necessary to attempt to avoid media and public scrutiny that healthcare decision makers are only after the “bottom line.” The same concerns occur in the social justice sector. Just as healthcare decision makers are faced with many diseases, each of which demands the technological, financial, and time commitment of the organization, CSEC is one of many injustices that come across the agendas of government organizations, child welfare agencies, and the like. With limited resources, both healthcare and social justice decision makers are faced with difficult choices of where to place their limited resources. With the accountability to tax payers (or private donors for NGOs) and consumers, there is an additional level of accountability tied to these decision makers in ensuring a fair decision making process. This is the basis of the A4R model, in that “key elements of fair process will involve transparency about the grounds for decisions; appeals to rationales that all can accept as relevant to meeting health needs fairly; and procedures for revising decisions in light of challenges to them” (Daniels 2000: 1300).

To further highlight the applicability of the A4R model to the current investigation, its basic tenets are comparable to those of other general organizational decision-making models, such as the “garbage can” model. The garbage can model of decision-making (proposed by Cohen, March, and Olsen) states that:

[D]ecisions are shaped by four more or less independent factors: 1. perceptions of current problems facing the organization; 2. potential “solutions,” ideas or actions that individual members of an organization wish to champion (e.g., the adoption of a new computer system, creation of a new office or function); 3. decision-making opportunities, meetings or committees that are assigned to make a recommendation for action; 4. participants, individuals who are present at decision-making opportunities (Tolbert and Hall 2009: 115).

To present a unified and condensed model of organizational priority setting that is pertinent to the current research, the above models and operationalizations can be summarized in the following three requirements for an issue to be accepted as an organizational priority as compared to other issues that also demand the organization’s attention: a) a fit with the organization’s internal vision/priorities, b) internal and external opportunities/restrictions, such as internal human resource opportunities for extended consideration of the decision to be made, financial resources, external mandates, or legislation, and c) some assessment (scientific or relative) of the likelihood to be successful.

As I am interested in the degree to which organizations place an emphasis on CSEC as important, it is assumed that the first requirement is met. With CSEC accepted as a social problem, as well as its clear illegality in the US, CSEC as a social justice issue would be an appropriate undertaking for all of the organizations included in this investigation. Second, in regards to internal and external restrictions, legislation dictates that CSEC is an abhorrent crime. There is opportunity for misinterpretation of this external mandate. However, all organizations have limited financial and human resources that would limit the degree to which making a decision to tackle an issue such as CSEC is constrained. Financial resources may not allow for the implementation of necessary combating strategies, while a sheer lack of human capital may not allow for CSEC to be added to the list of organizational priorities. The organizations under study may differ in their relative degree of resources, but it is assumed that these differences

equal out across a large sample size. Thus, requirement two of the unified model is also assumed to be met within these organizations.

As the first two requirements of the unified model are assumed to be met and roughly equivalent across all organizations, it is the third requirement, specifically the viability of solutions, that is particularly of interest to this investigation. Solutions to CSEC may be available, but not seen as feasible by the organization due to issues of scale flowing from a lack of resources or a different understanding of the environment that supports CSEC. Conversely, CSEC may be viewed as such an immense issue that a plausible solution is unknown. A look into how issues are perceived is warranted. In setting priorities, both organizations and individuals are influenced by the way in which issues are framed. The Yerkes-Dodson Law (Broadhurst 1959) captures two aspects that can dictate the prominence of a social problem. The law consists of an inverted-U relationship between arousal and performance, in that when arousal is extremely high or low, performance is at its lowest. At a moderate level of arousal, performance is at its peak. The general failure of “scared straight” tactics, in which delinquent adolescents are taken to prisons to scare them into compliance, is a demonstration of this relationship (e.g. Klenowski, Bell, and Dodson 2010). The teens become so overwhelmed by the experience (high arousal) that they deny that what they are experiencing reflects reality (low performance/success). To say that organizations experience arousal is anthropomorphizing. However, the Yerkes-Dodson Law can be used metaphorically in terms of social problems. Arousal can be equated to the way in which a social problem is framed, while performance is actions taken to combat the problem. An issue that has low arousal is framed as not a problem. If there is no problem, there is no action (low performance). Conversely, the way in which a social problem is framed can cause it to be presented in such a way that the issue appears

insurmountable. Arousal is so high that bounded rationality is exceeded and innovative solutions are not produced. Weick (1984) gives the example of soaring crime rates framed in the way that the only solution is to expand law enforcement. To achieve this, funds must be redirected away from schools, welfare, and job training. Such a solution results in expanded poverty, addiction, and prostitution, which creates a cycle of increased crime. Weick offers the concept of small wins as the way to tackle large social problems. Small wins are defined as “controllable opportunities that produce visible results” (43). If a social problem can be reconceptualized into a series of smaller problems, each smaller problem induces less arousal and thus the social problem as a whole can be more easily combated. At the same time, every win results in a reciprocal loss. Small wins equal small losses, and thus reduces the stakes with each problem and making it less likely that opponents will serve to dismantle efforts against the social problem.

My research will focus primarily on the factors that organizations perceive as influencing the number of CSEC cases they receive and their concurrent relationship with the degree to which the organizations report an emphasis on CSEC as important. Two questions will be addressed in regards to these significant factors: 1) what, if any, is the pattern among factors that are perceived as influential and not influential, and 2) are the perceived factors the same as those identified in the research literature as playing a role in CSEC? The first question pertains to the viability of solutions in the unified model of organizational priority setting. Viable solutions are necessary for a social injustice to be prioritized by an organization. What is deemed a viable solution will be guided by the small wins framework, in that an issue must be framed in such a way that it can be easily broken down in smaller, less difficult to combat problems. In this investigation, the influences can be viewed as the broken down problems, yet each of these also

needs to have a viable solution in order for a small win to be achieved. The second question will be addressed by comparing the influential factors to the research literature.

Based on this review, I propose to test the following three hypotheses:

Hypothesis One: Agencies that invest in preparing for CSEC cases will report an emphasis on CSEC as important.

It is logical that organizations that place an emphasis on combating CSEC will have preparation measures in place to properly address cases when they arise. However, the reverse is not necessarily true. Just because an organization has these measures in place does not mean that they place an emphasis on CSEC, as these organizations work on a variety of issues. Thus, they may have these measures in place for when CSEC cases arise, but CSEC may be of the least concern compared to other types of cases. Directionality cannot be established with the available data. It cannot be determined whether the organizations determine CSEC to be a priority and then implement preparation measures, or whether preparation measures are put in place and, as a result of directing resources toward this issue, it is then deemed a priority.

What can be established is whether there is a statistically significant difference between organizations that do and do not have various preparation measures in place and the concurrent importance that is placed on CSEC. The establishment of this relationship allows for the understanding of whether these variables need to be controlled for in other analyses, as well as whether the proportions of organizations that do and do not have these measures in place may be cause for concern in regards to whether CSEC is deemed important. Additionally, the implementation of preparation measures can be viewed as small wins in regards to combating CSEC. Resource limitations may restrict how many measures can be put in place, but in terms of

the overall picture of CSEC, preparing employees of the organizations is a small step in solving a larger problem.

Hypothesis Two: Organizations that report ‘changeable’ influence variables as important to the number of CSEC cases the organization handles will report an emphasis on CSEC.

The organizations were asked about a number of factors and the degree to which the respondent perceived the factor as an influence on the number of CSEC cases the organization receives, some of which have been discussed in research literature concerning CSEC. To account for the similarities and differences between influence variables that are and are not significant, the idea of small wins and organizational priorities being partly dependent upon readily available solutions is employed. Influences are perceived differently as to whether they are things that can be combated and changed or whether they are largely uncontrollable. As it pertains to this study, foreign population immigration, population size changes, racial community composition, and poverty can be designated as ‘non-changeable’ factors, as these tend to require system-wide changes, rather than solely the efforts of individuals or single organizations, and advocacy/awareness, law enforcement efforts, tourism, and nightlife establishments as ‘changeable,’ as individuals or small groups can cause significant change within these factors. This is not to say that the organizations themselves are actively working on or capable of changing these factors, but rather that if an influence is identified as important, efforts *could* be made to counter this influence. Changeable and non-changeable are not strict categories, as all of the factors in this study have conceivable solutions. However, the difficulty in bringing about change varies, resulting in organizations believing that they themselves or the community as a whole possess the resources in which to enact countermeasures.

To better understand this perspective, the following can be thought of as an example. An organization deciding to address foreign population immigration would be facing the possibility of extensive immigration reform, while another organization addressing racial community composition could be facing racially biased legislation and/or action. Combating population size changes may entail immigration reform, limits to emigration, and fertility control. All of these solutions have historically been unsuccessful or necessitated national level efforts. Poverty is an issue that the U.S. has been attempting to tackle for some time, yet specific, easily implemented solutions have not been identified. These are factors that an organization may view as essentially unchangeable, in that efforts of their own or of those in the local community would be unsuccessful at tackling the larger issue. Conversely, advocacy/awareness can be implemented on a local level by small groups of individuals. While generous resources may be helpful, they are not necessary. Similarly, law enforcement can tailor their focus within their jurisdiction without any additional resources if they are pushed to and aware of the need to focus on CSEC. Tourism and nightlife establishments can be promoted or countered locally, with petitions and boycotts at the community-level capable of being successful.

It should be noted that no specific hypothesis is being made about the influence variable ‘public policy changes,’ as it could be seen as changeable, but is already accounted for in the internal/external opportunities/restrictions portion of the organizational priority setting unified model. Public policy can be seen as changeable, in that our democratic system is set up to allow for legislative changes that are pushed by the public and politicians. However, because these organizations are required to act on public policy changes that arise, it follows the theoretical orientation to regard public policy changes as an external constraint rather than as one aspect of the conceivable solutions portion of organizational priority setting.

Hypothesis Three: The factors that the organizations report as important in influencing the number of CSEC cases they receive will not be the same as the factors existing research identifies as important in influencing CSEC.

Each of these factors has been researched in terms of its role in influencing CSEC and discussed above. This hypothesis is intended to compare whether the organizations that are handling CSEC cases are identifying the same influential factors as researchers in regards of their likelihood to report an emphasis on CSEC. The hypothesis that they will not be the same coincides with the second hypothesis, based upon the priority setting literature and the conceivability of solutions. Not all of the factors that influence CSEC may be readily solved, so the organizations may unintentionally be blind to their influence since a solution is not easily achieved. This is in line with the theoretical framework in that the way social problems are perceived and deemed important are not necessarily in line with reality. On the other hand, it is also possible that this blindness is not an issue, in that organizations and researchers are correctly identifying various influences. If such a disconnect between organizations and research is found, then further work will need to parse out where the issue is, whether it is with the information researchers are obtaining or with how organizations are perceiving CSEC.

METHODS

Data for this project come from a larger project into sexual exploitation and CSEC in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico (Estes and Weiner 2003). The portion of the data used here, titled “Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the United States,” were collected to identify the nature of CSEC, subgroups of children at the greatest risk of exploitation, subgroups of adult exploiters, and modes/methods of exploitation. Included in the data is a section specific to the organizations themselves and their perceptions of factors that influence the number of CSEC cases received, which is the basis for my work.

Senior staff members of both government and nongovernment organizations that handle CSEC cases were surveyed, though these organizations were not required to focus on CSEC exclusively (e.g. child and family agencies, municipal law enforcement, state child welfare organizations, the FBI, United States Customs). Surveys were sent to a stratified random sample of organizations. Of the government organizations, there was a 24% response rate for a total of 182 respondents and a response rate of 22% for a total of 89 respondents among nongovernmental organizations. For this analysis, eleven cases were dropped (ten governmental and one nongovernmental) from the original data¹. It is not known whether organizations that did not respond to the survey differ in any respect from those included in this study. While it cannot be said whether the sample is representative of all organizations that encounter cases of CSEC, one question of representation that can be addressed is whether only organizations that place an emphasis on CSEC responded. With a low response rate, it is possible that organizations that do not emphasize CSEC failed to respond, and we are left with an oversampling of organizations that place an emphasis on combating CSEC. This potential oversampling does not appear to be

¹ Ten of the dropped cases only possessed the city, state, and zip code, but did not have responses to any of the survey questions. An additional case did not have responses to any information or survey questions.

an issue. The mean value for the variable that pertains to the emphasis the organization places on CSEC is 2.417 on a one to four scale, indicating that the mean falls in the middle of all possible response choices with the responses to this variable being normally distributed. As these organizations are not on one extreme or the other in regards to placing an emphasis on CSEC as important, it does not appear that this uncertainty invalidates the current findings.

It should also be noted that the low response rate may be due to the extent of the questions. Many asked for specific numbers, such as how many counties are served by the organization, that would involve looking into databases and archives to retrieve the information. Other archived data, such as how many CSEC cases from 1999 involved individuals 17 years of age or younger, may not be kept by the organization or unavailable to the specific respondent.

Measures (see Appendix 1 for the exact wording of the survey questions used)

Multiple measures of colinearity were used to measure potential spurious relationships among variables. These tests indicated no issues among the variables of interest.

Emphasis on CSEC as important

The dependent variable of interest is whether the organizations place an emphasis on CSEC as a policy issue. The responses to this question originally included “most important,” “important,” “somewhat important,” and “not important,” thus asking participants to rank CSEC among the various types of cases the organization receives. Data were available for emphasis on CSEC as a policy issue and emphasis on CSEC as a service issue, with different and independent questions for each. Saying an issue is important through policy is different from how this translates to implementation (service). For example, in a review of responses to CSEC in New York, Cedeño (2012) discussed how Safe Harbor legislation requires short-term shelter and long-term safe houses for CSEC victims, though this is only required to the extent that funding is

available. As the current theoretical approach focuses on priority setting, (priorities are claims that are made not necessarily actions that are taken), emphasis on CSEC as a policy issue is appropriate. Addressing CSEC as a service issue would entail a different approach, such as discussing the disconnects between policy and action and limitations to service implementation.

For this investigation, the emphasis variable was recoded into a binary measure, with emphasis on CSEC as important or not important. This binary was arrived at via alpha scaling of three variables (emphasis on CSEC as a policy issue in 1997, 1998, and 1999, all measured on the above mentioned 4 point Likert-type scale) combined into two responses (the new response “important” consisting of the previous “important” and “most important” responses and the new response “not important” consisting of the previous “not important” and “somewhat important” responses). Creating a binary from the original one-to-four scale split the sample essentially at the original data’s mean (2.417, SD 0.929). Thus, the emphasis variable can, generally, be viewed as organizations that rank CSEC as either more or less important than the average.

Influence variables

The influence variables were measured by the question “[p]lease rate the relative importance of the factors listed below in influencing *the number of cases of CSEC in your service area.*” All ten of these influence variables are considered. The original variables were measured on the same 4-point Likert-type scale as the emphasis variable and then broken down into a not important/important binary for analysis.

Preparation variables

Three variables pertain to different measures the organizations may or may not have in place to prepare employees for handling CSEC cases: whether the organization provides training on

CSEC, possesses a working definition of CSEC, and possesses a manual on handling CSEC cases.

Mediators

Five potential mediators were originally considered that may influence the number of cases an organization encounters: the organization's service area (national, regional, state, local, or some other service area, with each area coded as yes/no), whether the organization is governmental or nongovernmental (yes/no), 'states served' (continuous), 'counties served' (continuous), and total number of cases handled in 1999 (continuous). The size of a service area may influence the number of cases an organization receives, and the number of cases an organization receives may influence the emphasis that is placed on CSEC due to its prevalence. Thus, these variables were included in all models to control for their potential mediating relationship. When training was controlled for, none of these mediators had a significant effect on emphasis on CSEC. So long as training was controlled for, no significant differences were observed when these mediators were or were not included. For this reason as well as for model simplicity, they were removed from the models included here.

RESULTS

In accordance with the above hypotheses, cross-tabulations and binomial logistic regressions are utilized to investigate the relationship between CSEC preparation measures and organizational emphasis on CSEC. Taking these results into account, additional logistic regressions and a progressive adjustment (i.e. nested models) are used to investigate the factors that influence the number of CSEC cases the organizations receive. Whether or not these analyses support their corresponding hypotheses are mentioned briefly here and expanded upon in the discussion section of this paper. Table 1 highlights the descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and frequencies of all variables used in these analyses.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD	Yes Frequency	No Frequency	N
National Service Area	0.241	0.429	41	129	170
Regional Service Area	0.436	0.497	79	102	181
State Service Area	0.532	0.500	101	89	190
Local Service Area	0.878	0.329	193	27	220
Other Service Area	0.447	0.501	34	42	76
Agency Provides Training on CSEC	0.450	0.498	107	131	238
Agency Has a Working Definition of CSEC	0.152	0.359	37	207	244
Agency Has a Manual on Handling CSEC	0.189	0.393	46	197	243
Agency is a Government Organization	0.661	0.474	170	87	257
Emphasis on CSEC as a Policy Issue	0.492	0.501	118	122	240
	Mean	SD	Important Frequency	Not Important Frequency	N
Influence of Foreign Population Immigration	0.240	0.248	52	165	217
Influence of Public Policy Changes	0.442	0.498	96	121	217
Influence of Advocacy/Awareness	0.536	0.450	111	96	207
Influence of Population Size Changes	0.246	0.432	52	159	211
Influence of Poverty	0.386	0.488	83	132	215
Influence of Racial Community Composition	0.257	0.438	54	156	210
Influence of Tourism/Conventions	0.127	0.334	27	185	212
Influence of Federal Law Enforcement Efforts	0.425	0.495	90	122	212
Influence of Local Law Enforcement Efforts	0.561	0.497	120	94	214
Influence of Nightlife Establishments	0.292	0.456	61	148	209

Both cross-tabulations with Chi-squared estimations (Table 2) and a binomial logistic regression (Table 3) are used to test the first hypothesis, that agencies that invest in preparation measures will report an emphasis on CSEC. The Chi-squared estimations indicate that a statistically significant difference between organizations that do or do not possess each of these preparation measures, as well as between government and non-government organizations, is present. Once these variables are regressed together, possessing a working definition loses its significance in relation to emphasis on CSEC. From these two analyses, organizations that invest in preparation measures or are a government organization are more likely to report an emphasis on CSEC, supporting Hypothesis One. However, these variables are also included in later analyses, in which their significance is not as strong.

Table 2. Cross-Tabulations of Emphasis on CSEC

	Emphasis on CSEC as Important	Emphasis on CSEC as Not Important	Total
Provides Training	72 (68.57%)	33 (31.43%)	105
No Training	41 (32.03%)	87 (67.97%)	128
	Chi ² = 30.8345***		
Possesses a Working Definition	24 (64.86%)	13 (35.14%)	37
No Working Definition	93 (46.73%)	106 (53.27%)	199
	Chi ² = 4.1029***		
Possess a Manual	35 (77.78%)	10 (22.22%)	45
No Manual	81 (42.19%)	111 (57.81%)	192
	Chi ² = 30.8345***		
Government Organization	88 (55.35%)	71 (44.65%)	159
NGO	30 (37.04%)	51 (62.96%)	81
	Chi ² = 30.8345***		

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Table 3. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC on Various Factors from Binary Logistic Regression

Training	3.497***
Working Definition	0.601
Manual	3.580*
Government	2.052*
Constant	0.295***
Log Likelihood = -136.883; Pseudo R ² = 0.137; N = 229	

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Hypotheses Two (organizations that report ‘changeable’ influence variables as important to the number of CSEC cases received will report an emphasis on CSEC) and Three (the factors that the organizations report as important to the number of CSEC cases received will not be the same as those identified in the research literature) are tested with the same analyses. Table 4 shows the results of the influence variables regressed against the emphasis variable. Advocacy/awareness, public policy changes, and population size changes are significantly related to placing an emphasis on CSEC, in that organizations that report these influence variables as important to the number of CSEC cases that are received are more likely to also report an emphasis on CSEC as important. Because of the significance of the preparation and government variable previously, they should also be included in reference to the influence variables due to their potential mediating effect.

Table 5 shows the results of a binomial logistic regression progressive adjustment, beginning with training, adding in the influence variables, and including the remaining preparation variables and the government variable. Training was included prior to the other preparation variables due to many more organizations providing training than possessing the other preparation variables, as well as it having the highest degree of significance previously (Table 3). Training remains highly significant across all models, although the degree of effect decreases with each additional model. With the addition of the influence variables, results change slightly from the regression of the influence variables alone. Both advocacy/awareness and population size changes are significant across all models. There is some deviation in the degree and strength of effect of advocacy/awareness, while degree and strength are nearly identical across all models for population size changes. With training controlled for, public policy changes are no longer

significantly related to an emphasis on CSEC. No variables are significant that were not previously.

Table 4. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC

Foreign Population	1.597	Racial Community Composition	1.498
Public Policy Changes	2.406*	Tourism/Conventions	1.041
Advocacy/Awareness	3.867***	Federal Law Enforcement Efforts	1.524
Population Size Changes	0.267*	Local Law Enforcement Efforts	2.540
Poverty	0.933	Nightlife Establishments	0.834
Constant	0.210		
Log Likelihood = -102.443; Pseudo R ² = 0.2167; N = 189			

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Table 5. Odds Ratios of Emphasis on CSEC on Various Factors from Progressive Adjustment (Binary Logistic Regression; N=181)

	Model 8.1	Model 8.2	Model 8.3
Training	5.391***	4.007***	3.277**
Foreign Population		2.227	2.02
Public Policy Changes		2.245	1.939
Advocacy/Awareness		2.962*	3.618**
Population Size Changes		0.278*	0.261*
Poverty		1.191	1.436
Racial Community Composition		1.227	1.135
Tourism/Conventions		0.891	0.902
Federal Law Enforcement Efforts		1.803	1.234
Local Law Enforcement Efforts		1.881	1.846
Nightlife Establishments		0.909	1.272
Working Definition			0.963
Manual			2.176
Government			2.267
Constant	.500**	0.120***	0.067***
Log Likelihood	-110.732	-91.436	-89.265
Pseudo R ²	0.1164	0.2704	0.2877

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

The results presented in tables 4 and 5 do not support Hypothesis Two. With only three of the influence variables reaching significance, a changeable/non-changeable pattern is not established. In terms of correspondence with the literature, some inconsistency is found, thus partially supporting Hypothesis Three. Hypothesis One is no longer fully supported, as only the preparation measure of training retains its significance.

DISCUSSION

This study set out to determine whether organizations that encounter CSEC place an emphasis on CSEC relative to other types of cases, as well as what factors play a role in this emphasis. In addition, this study was concerned with whether these organizations reported the same factors as influences on the number of CSEC cases they receive as are recorded in the research literature as factors that influence CSEC or coincide with risk for victimization. Few analyses resulted in continuously significant variables. However, this is a case in which a lack of significance is not a lack of results. In fact, this makes the findings of this study all the more significant as they are more than just consistent or inconsistent with theory, but depart from any comparability. Returning back to the three hypotheses, each hypothesis is partially supported and partially inconsistent with the findings.

The first hypothesis asks whether organizations that possess preparation measures for CSEC cases are statistically significantly different in their emphasis on CSEC as compared to those that do not have these measures in place. Specifically, it is hypothesized that organizations that do possess these measures will report an emphasis on CSEC. Initially, this hypothesis is supported. Cross-tabulations and chi-squared estimates indicate that organizations that provide training on CSEC, possess a working definition of CSEC, or possess a manual on handling CSEC cases are statistically different in the degree to which they report an emphasis on CSEC as important (whether an organization is governmental or non-governmental to investigate whether differences between the type of organization exist and need to be accounted for. The results are similar to those of the preparation variables). Of the organizations that provide training on CSEC, more than twice as many report an emphasis on CSEC as important and vice versa, with organizations that do not provide training being less likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as not

important. Similar results are shown for the remaining variables. However, once the influence variables are considered (Table 5), the only continuous result is that organizations that provide training on CSEC are more likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as important. Compared to organizations that do not provide training, organizations that provide training have 227.7% to 439.1% greater odds of reporting an emphasis on CSEC as important (odds ratios between 3.277 and 5.391).

However, even though all of the organizations in this study handle cases of CSEC, the majority do not have such preparation measures in place. While 45.06% of the organizations that responded to both the training and emphasis questions provide training on CSEC, only 15.68% possess a working definition of CSEC, and 18.99% possess a manual on handling CSEC cases. Again, directionality cannot be established. It is not known whether the organizations place an emphasis on CSEC and then implement these preparation measures or whether these measures are implemented and, as a result, CSEC later is deemed important. A temporal relationship could be established in future research. This investigation shows that the connection between training and other preparation measures and emphasis on CSEC is statistically significant and important, yet the percentages tell us that few organizations possess these measures.

The second hypothesis utilizes the small wins perspective to predict that organizations that perceive changeable influence variables as contributing to the number of cases the organization receives will also report an emphasis on CSEC as important. No pattern was found between the influence variables that did or did not correspond with an emphasis on CSEC. Too many variables were insignificant and too few significant for a changeable/non-changeable pattern to be established. Even without a consistent pattern, the influence variables that did reach significance follow the changeable/non-changeable framework. When only the influence

variables are considered (Table 4), public policy changes, advocacy/awareness, and population size changes are significant. Specifically, organizations that perceive public policy changes and advocacy/awareness as important to the number of CSEC cases the organization receives are more likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as important (odds ratios of 2.406 and 3.867, respectively). Conversely, organizations that perceive population size changes as important to the number of CSEC cases the organization receives are less likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as important (odds ratio of 0.267). As discussed previously, advocacy/awareness is viewed as a changeable influence in the small wins framework due to the viability of a solution. Increasing awareness is a task that can be tackled locally with relatively few resources (although substantial resources can aid in the speed and ease of this task). Population size changes can only be addressed through large scale immigration/emigration changes or fertility control. Such work generally cannot be handled on a local level, and thus population size changes are viewed as unchangeable. Public policy changes are viewed in this theoretical framework as an external mandate, and thus cannot be discussed in the small wins changeable/non-changeable context.

Once training, the other preparation variables, and governmental affiliation is controlled for (Table 5), the same results are found, with the exception of public policy changes dropping out of significance, indicating that training is masking the effect of public policy changes. This suggests that the relationship between training and emphasis on CSEC is so strong that once training is considered, public policy changes as an influence on the number of CSEC cases received is reduced to such miniscule comparative importance that it is no longer significant.

The third hypothesis asks about the similarity between the factors the organizations report as significant to the number of CSEC cases they receive and those that the research literature reports as influential. It must be remembered that these influence variables are the perceptions of

the respondents. No additional measures are present to confirm that what the respondents are reporting as influential to the number of cases his/her organizations receives are an accurate reflection of the actual conditions. It is hypothesized that the factors the organizations report as influential will not be the same as the research literature due to some factors having foreseeable solutions while others are more difficult or impossible to combat. While some consistency was found, there was also inconsistency. In the final model, organizations that reported advocacy/awareness and population size changes as influential were more likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as important. A lack of awareness or knowledge is discussed in the research literature as a factor in misidentifying or overlooking CSEC cases. In this research, organizations that report advocacy/awareness as important in influencing the number of CSEC cases the organization receives have between 196.2% and 286.7% greater odds (or roughly between three and four times more likely) of also reporting an emphasis on CSEC as important. Organizations that report population size changes as influencing the number of cases they receive are less likely to report an emphasis on CSEC as important (odds ratios between 0.261 and 0.278). Population size changes are not discussed explicitly in the literature, but the presence of transient male populations is. While these two are not equivalent, a similarity does exist. Organizations that report public policy changes as influencing the number of cases they receive have between 93.9% and 124.5% greater odds of also reporting an emphasis on CSEC as important. The increase in legislation pertaining to CSEC, both globally and domestically, was discussed above. As this legislation aims to aid in combating CSEC by such avenues as clarifying definitions of victims and increasing penalties for offenders, this finding of public policy changes as significant is consistent with the increasing prevalence of CSEC legislation. Even with these consistencies, many of the other influence variables in this investigation are comparable to those in the CSEC

literature, such as poverty and law enforcement efforts, but no other influences were significant in any model. Thus, Hypothesis Three is partially supported, as variables that the research literature indicates as important in CSEC are not reported as important by the organizations that also report an emphasis on CSEC as important, while some that research indicates are important are reported by the organizations.

With so many insignificant results, another look at the descriptive statistics (Table 1) is warranted. The means are low throughout many of the influence variables, demonstrating that few of the variables are reported by many organizations as important to the number of CSEC cases the organizations receive. This, combined with the fact that only three of the influence variables reached significance in any model, raises a key question: why were none of these influences reported as important to the number of cases the organizations receive? Do none of these influences play the role as discussed in the academic literature on CSEC, meaning the conclusions researchers are making are inaccurate? If so, are the researchers' methods inappropriate, or are victims, intentionally or unintentionally, inaccurately portraying their experiences? Do the organizations perceive the factors that influence their caseloads incorrectly? If so, are the organizations misconstruing their cases, despite training on the subject? Alternatively, is it that each organization experiences such different caseloads that there is no common trend, or is there in fact no pattern to how a social problem develops in regards to small wins influencing organizational priority setting? This study alone cannot tease out these answers. It can only suggest that somewhere along the lines, theory and practice are not lining up.

An alternative explanation may explain why few of the influence variables are perceived by the organizations as influencing the number of CSEC cases they receive, as well as why Hypotheses Two (small wins changeable/non-changeable influences) and Three (consistency

with the research literature) were largely unsupported. This investigation took the three requirements of the proposed unified model of organizational priority setting and focused on the third requirement (some assessment of likelihood of success, specifically in terms of the viability of solutions), having assumed that the first two requirements (organizational fit and internal/external restrictions) are met and essentially the same and equalized out across organizations. However, the external mandates on the organizations may be so strong that the third requirement is nullified. The externalities that the organizations encounter, represented by the influence variables, and their viable solutions in regards to combating CSEC may not be relevant at all. While public policy changes are already interpreted as an external legislative mandate, perhaps advocacy/awareness is also more closely related to an external mandate than a perceived influence with a viable solution. The publicity surrounding CSEC, especially child sex trafficking, is continually on the rise, with such events as PSAs being sponsored by celebrities and commercials running before and during major athletic events. The A4R model of healthcare priority setting discusses accountability to shareholders and consumers. Advocacy/awareness may be pushing organizations to take on CSEC as a priority as a form of public accountability due to its publicity and acceptance as a social problem. Rather than advocacy/awareness being prominent due to considering whether the empirical conditions of their jurisdictions (the degree to which the conditions in their area reflect those in the CSEC literature) raise concerns of CSEC prevalence, advocacy/awareness is increased due to publicity, public interest, and legislation. Thus, advocacy/awareness and public policy changes may both function as external mandates on organizational priority setting, driving the adoption of CSEC as a priority in and of themselves, regardless of viable solutions to the social injustice. The role of population size changes in this

alternative explanation may simply be that when more individuals are present, the opportunities for crime and exploitation are increased.

While causality between the preparation measures and emphasis on CSEC was not discussed in this investigation, in this alternative explanation it may be that because CSEC is deemed a priority, the implementation of training programs is more likely. With many more organizations reporting that training is provided than possessing a working definition of or manual on handling CSEC cases, this explanation is logical. The concern that the other preparation measures are rare among these organizations is still present. If training is occurring, but working definitions and manuals are not available, what are the organizations training their employees on? Where is this training material coming from? With few of the influence variables that are supported by the research literature perceived by the organizations as important factors in the number of CSEC cases they receive, it is possible that this research is also not recognized when implementing training procedures, although this possibility cannot be assessed with this data.

CONCLUSION

Working with data on organizations that handle cases of the commercial sexual exploitation of children, there is little consistency between the factors that research identifies as contributing to CSEC and the factors that the organizations perceive as influencing the number of CSEC cases they receive. Just under half of the organizations provide training on CSEC, while the vast majority does not have a working definition of CSEC or manual on handling CSEC cases. With these findings and their inconsistency with the proposed organizational priority setting and small wins theoretical framework, it is possible that organizations are prioritizing CSEC because it is the current hot-button social justice issue, both in terms of advocacy and legislation/public policy. However, because of these external mandates on priority setting, it is possible that the organizations are not developing thoughtful or empirically driven trainings in which to handle CSEC cases.

Further research needs to address where the discrepancy between research and practice is occurring, whether research is inaccurate, organizations are misinterpreting their cases, or there is some combination thereof, such as the alternative external mandate explanation. Longitudinal data are especially necessary in order to attempt to tease out causality of priority setting. Not only this, but researchers need to expand their scope to learn more about the organizations that handle CSEC cases. The current data on organizations are limited. Most research is focused on identifying and aiding CSEC victims and current data are largely outdated, considering national and international laws and agreements have been adopted since much of the available data were collected. Recent legislation has, hopefully, increased the emphasis and success of CSEC organizations. This plays into the question of whether a representative sample is possible with hidden populations, a question that needs to be debated to enhance the legitimacy of CSEC

research. Further, qualitative analysts need to investigate the ways in which we frame CSEC in advocacy/awareness campaigns and in the media, as the public's image of CSEC undoubtedly influences how this social problem is perceived and, in turn, how anti-CSEC organizations operate and frame their work.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX: SURVEY QUESTIONS

3. How would you describe your agency's service area (circle as many as apply):

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| a) National | Y | N |
| b) Regional | Y | N |
| c) State | Y | N |
| d) Local | Y | N |
| e) Other, please describe: _____ | Y | N |

4. How many *states* are served by your agency? Please enter the number in the spaces provided to the right, or circle "N/A" for not applicable. ____ ____ ____ N/A

6. How many *counties* (or other governmental units, if your state does not have counties) are served by your agency? Please enter the number in the spaces provided to the right. Circle "N/A" for not applicable. ____ ____ ____ N/A

8. Please write in the *total number of cases* handled by your agency in 1998. Circle "NA" if not applicable. _____ N/A

The following questions seek to identify the *policies and procedures* employed by your agency in handling CSEC cases.

10. Please rate the relative emphasis on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) as a *policy* issue for your agency according to the following:

- 1- Most important
- 2- Important
- 3- Somewhat important
- 4- Not important

Please circle your response.

- | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|---|
| a) 1997 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) 1998 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) 1999 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

11. Please rate the relative importance of the factors listed below in influencing *the number of cases of CSEC in your service area* according to the following ratings:

- 1- Most important
- 2- Important
- 3- Somewhat important
- 4- Not important

Please circle your response.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Immigration of foreign populations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Changes in legislation/public policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Advocacy/awareness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Fluctuations in population size | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Poverty | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) Racial/ethnic composition of community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) Tourism/ conferences and conventions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) Federal law enforcement efforts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i) Local law enforcement efforts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j) "Nightlife" establishments/districts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| k) Other, please specify: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| l) Other, please specify: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

12. Does your agency have a *working definition* of CSEC? Yes No

13. The following questions ask you to describe your agency's *approach* to dealing with CSEC. Please circle "Y" (Yes) if your agency participates in the listed training and policies regarding CSEC.

a) Does your agency have a policy and procedure *manual* regarding the handling of CSEC cases?

Y
N

b) Does your agency provide staff training regarding CSEC? If yes, please specify:

Y
N

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Bolling, Michelle, and Erin Harper. 2007. *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children* [white paper, electronic version]. Georgia State University Center for School Safety, School Climate and Classroom Management website: <http://education.gsu.edu/schoolsafety/>
- Boxhill, Nancy A., and Deborah J. Richardson. 2007. "Ending Sex Trafficking of Children in Atlanta." *Affilia* 22(2):138-149
- Broadhurst, P. L. 1959. "The Interaction of Task Difficulty and Motivation: The Yerkes-Dodson Law Revived." *Acta Psychologica* 16:321-338.
- Cedeño, Marihug. 2012. "Pimps, Johns, and Juvenile Prostitutes: Is New York doing enough to combat the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children?" *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy* 22:153-179.
- Chase, Elaine, and June Statham. 2005. "Commercial and Sexual Exploitation of Children and Young People in the UK--A Review." *Child Abuse Review* 14(1):4-25
- Clawson, Heather J., Nicole Dutch, Amy Solomon, and Lisa Goldblatt Grace. 2009. "Human Trafficking into and within the United States: A Review of the Literature". Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/07/HumanTrafficking/>
- Cobbina, Jennifer E., and Sharon S. Oselin. 2011. "It's Not Only for the Money: An Analysis of Adolescent versus Adult Entry into Street Prostitution." *Sociological Inquiry* 81(3):310-332.
- Cohen, Joshua. 1994. "Pluralism and Proceduralism." *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 69:589-618.
- Daniels, Norman. 2000. "Accountability for Reasonableness: Establishing a Fair Process for Priority Setting is Easier than Agreeing on Principles." *BMJ* 321:1300-1301.
- Daniels, Norman, and James E. Sabin. 1997. "Limits to Health Care: Fair Procedures, Democratic Deliberation, and the Legitimacy Problem for Insurers." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 26(4):303-350.
- Daniels, Norman, and James E. Sabin. 2002. *Setting Limits Fairly: Can We Learn to Share Medical Resources?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Estes, Richard J., and Neil Alan Weiner. 2001. *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico*. Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work Center for the Study of Youth Policy.

- Estes, Richard J., and Neil Alan Weiner. 2002. *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico*. Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work Center for the Study of Youth Policy.
- Estes, Richard J., and Neil Alan Weiner. 2003. "Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the United States, 1997-2000." ICPSR version. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2003. <http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03366.v1>
- Estes, Richard J., and Neil Alan Weiner. 2005. The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the United States. In Cooper, S. W., R. J. Estes, A. P. Giardino, N. D. Kellogg & V. I. Vieth (Eds.), *Medical, Legal & Social Science Aspects of Child Sexual Exploitation: A Comprehensive Review of Child Pornography, Child Prostitution, and Internet Crimes Against Children* (pp. 95-128). St. Louis, MO: GW Medical.
- Farley, Melissa, and Vanessa Kelly. 2000. "Prostitution: A Critical Review of the Medical and Social Sciences Literature." *Women and Criminal Justice* 11(4):29-64.
- Farrell, Amy, and Rebecca Pfeffer. 2014. "Policing Human Trafficking: Cultural Binders and Organizational Barriers." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 653:46-64.
- Finkelhor, David, and Richard Ormrod. 2004. "Prostitution of Juveniles: Patterns from NIBRS." *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin* 1-12.
- Fong, Rowena, and Jodi B. Cardoso. 2010. "Child Human Trafficking Victims: Challenges for the Child Welfare System." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 33(3):311-316.
- Gibson, Jennifer L., Douglas K. Martin, and Peter A. Singer. 2004. "Setting Priorities in Health Care Organizations: Criteria, Processes, and Parameters of Success." *BMC Health Services Research* 4(25). <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/4/25>
- Grace, Lisa G., Maureen Starck, Jane Potenza, Patricia A. Kenney, and Anne H. Sheetz. 2012. "Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and the School Nurse." *Journal of School Nursing* 28(6):410-417
- Greenbaum, Jordan, M.D., and James Crawford-Jakubiak. 2015. "Child Sex Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation: Health Care Needs of Victims." *Pediatrics* 135(3):566-574.
- Greene, Jody M., Susan T. Ennett, and Christopher Ringwalt. 1999. "Prevalence and Correlates of Survival Sex among Runaway and Homeless Youth." *American Journal of Public Health* 89(9):1406-1409.
- Gutierrez, Estrella. 1998. Rights: Child Traffic in Venezuela Tip of the Iceberg (January 11). <http://www.oneworld.org/ips2/jan98/venezuela2.html>.

- Hofstede, Al. 1999. *The Hofstede Committee Report: Juvenile Prostitution in Minnesota*.
- Hodgson, Douglas. 1995. "Combating the Organized Sexual Exploitation of Asian Children: Recent Developments and Prospects." *International Journal of Law and the Family* 9(1):23-53.
- Hunnicut, Sandra. 2001. "Nightmare on Main Street," unpublished paper presented at the Hastings School of Law, February 9.
- Klenowski, Paul M., Keith J. Bell, and Kimberly D. Dodson. 2010. "An Empirical Evaluation of Juvenile Programs in the United States: Can Juveniles be "Scared Straight"?" *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 49(4):254-272.
- Kohn, M. L. 1976. "Looking Back—A 25-Year Review and Appraisal of Social Problems Research." *Social Problems* 24:94-112.
- Lauer, Robert H. 1976. "Defining Social Problems: Public and Professional Perspectives." *Social Problems* 24(1):122-130.
- Melrose, Margaret, David Barnett, and Isabelle Brodie. 1999. *One Way Street? Retrospectives on Childhood Prostitution*. The Children's Society and University of London.
- Merton, Robert. K. 1971. "Epilogue: Social Problems and Sociological Theory." In R. Merton & R. Nisbet (Eds.), *Contemporary Social Problems* (p. 793-846). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mitchell, Kimberly J., Lisa M. Jones, David Finkelhor, and Janis Wolak. 2011. "Internet-Facilitated Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: Findings from a Nationally Representative Sample of Law Enforcement Agencies in the United States." *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 23(1):43-71
- Moon, Katharine H. S. 1997. *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*. Columbia University Press.
- Pearce, Jenny J., Mary Williams, and Cristina Galvin. 2003. *It's Someone Taking a Part of You: A Study of Young Women and Sexual Exploitation*. London: National Children's Bureau.
- Rawls, John. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Reid, Joan A., and Shayne Jones. 2011. "Exploited Vulnerability: Legal and Psychological Perspectives on Child Sex Trafficking Victims." *Victims & Offenders* 6(2):207-231.
- Reid, Joan A., and Alex R. Piquero. 2014. "On the Relationship between Commercial Sexual Exploitation/Prostitution, Substance Dependency, and Delinquency in Youthful Offender." *Child Maltreatment* 19(3-4):257-260.

- Scarpa, Silvia. 2006. "Child Trafficking: International Instruments to Protect the Most Vulnerable Victims." *Family Court Review* 44(3):429–447.
- Spector, Malcolm, and John I. Kitsuse. 2001. *Constructing Social Problems*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Taylor-Browne, Julie. 2002. *More than One Chance! Young People Involved in Prostitution Speak Out*. ECPAT UK
- Tolbert, Pamela S., and Richard H Hall 2009. *Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes*. 10th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, 22 U.S.C. § 7105 (b) (1) (E) (u) (2000).
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). 2000. *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime*. November 15: New York.
- Walker-Rodriguez, Amanda, and Rodney Hill J.D. 2011. "Human Sex Trafficking." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 80(3):1-9.
- Weick, Karl E. 1984. "Small Wins: Redefining the Scale of Social Problems." *American Psychologist* 39(1):40-49.
- Weitzer, Ronald. 2014. "New Directions in Research on Human Trafficking." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 653(6):6-24.