Child Exploitation Literature Scan

Extended review

Authors:
Jacinta Cording
Zara Collinson
Marnie Carter

ALLEN + CLARKE

Purpose of summary

- This document provides a high-level summary of the emerging findings from the child exploitation literature scan.
- The summary will inform practice guidance about child exploitation and more broadly contribute to understanding of modern day slavery.

Structure of summary

- The first section of the high-level summary focuses on **child exploitation** in general, i.e. information that is equally relevant to sexual and labour exploitation of children.
- Then information related to **child labour exploitation** more specifically is summarised.
- And is followed by an overview of information specific to **sexual exploitation of children**.
- The final section provides an extended review of more specific areas of interest, including **indicators** of labour exploitation, labour exploitation among **migrants**, the role of **religious organisations** in child exploitation prevention, and risk of exploitation by specific **familial relationships**.
- A **bibliography** of reviewed sources, as well as an overview of the **methodology** used, is provided at the end of the document.

Child exploitation

Child exploitation definitions

- **Definitions of exploitation differ** depending on jurisdiction or organisation.
- **Child sexual exploitation** (aka commercial sexual exploitation of children; **CSEC**): the exchange of any sexual acts for goods, services, drugs, or money by an individual under the age of 16.
    - Can include creation or distribution of **child sexual exploitation material** (CSEM).
- **Child labour exploitation**: the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purposes of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery of an individual under the age of 18.
- Both may involve **human trafficking**: enlisting, transporting, forcing and/or trading individuals illegally for the purposes of sexual or labour exploitation (Lyons, 2021).
- There is substantially **greater research and policy focus on sexual exploitation** compared to labour exploitation, although research on both is limited and lacking methodological rigour (Franklin et al., 2018; Macy, 2018; Okech et al., 2018).

Child welfare agencies play a key role in prevention and intervention

- Child welfare workers can play a role in **identifying** children or young people being exploited, or at risk of being exploited, and **referring** to appropriate immediate or long-term support programmes and other community resources (Lim et al., 2020; Lyons, 2021; Pate et al., 2021).
  - Often, exploited children and young people **come into contact** with child welfare agencies because of housing or other service needs, rather than seeking specific exploitation intervention (Lim et al., 2020).
- Workers within **youth justice systems** can also play a key role in identification and referral, as young people may become involved in justice systems through being misidentified as offenders (Pate et al., 2021).
- Effective prevention and intervention responses **involve multi-agency collaboration** with police, non-government and community providers, and health systems (Burke et al., 2015; Hickle & Hallett, 2016; McKibbin & Humphreys, 2019; Okech et al., 2018).
  - But there is a **lack of rigorous evaluation** of prevention, assessment and intervention approaches to guide social work practice (Felner & DuBois, 2017; Macy, 2018).

A number of key risk factors for exploitation have been identified

- **Homeless and runaway youth** are at a high risk of both sexual and labour exploitation (Choi, 2015; Dierkhising et al., 2020; Greenbaum et al., 2022; Latzman et al., 2019; Reid, 2018; Pate et al., 2021).
  - There is a need to ensure that runaways from youth residences are **taken seriously** by police and other agencies (McKibbin & Humphreys, 2019).
- Unaccompanied and/or undocumented **migrant young people** are also at a higher risk of both forms of exploitation (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
  - May be **misidentified** as "smuggled" or unaccompanied minors.
- **Adverse childhood experiences**, including physical, sexual and psychological abuse, common among exploited children and young people (Brandt et al., 2021; Choi, 2015; Pate et al., 2021).
  - May be **more prevalent for sexual** rather than labour exploitation
- Children and young people in **poverty** are at a higher risk of exploitation (Pate et al., 2021).
- **Mental health and substance abuse** issues are also common (Brandt et al., 2021; Franklin et al., 2018; Panlilio et al., 2019; Pate et al., 2021)

Engagement with child welfare may directly and indirectly increase risk

- There is a higher risk of exploitation for children and youth **involved with child welfare**, through additional trauma and/or continued maltreatment (Brandt et al., 2021; Panlilio et al., 2022; Pate et al., 2021; Shuker, 2015).
- Young people **living in residential or other out-of-home care** are at particularly high risk of exploitation, due to instability and increased risk of further maltreatment, including by staff and peers (Gatwiri et al., 2020; McKibbin et al., 2022; Reid, 2018; Pate et al., 2021).
  - **Improving the environment** within foster care may prevent both further maltreatment, and reduce the risk of young people running away, thereby reducing risk of exploitation (Latzman et al., 2019).
- Victims of exploitation **may also end up in the child welfare system** due to a lack of parental supervision, and truancy or running away associated with the exploitation (Lim et al., 2020; Pate et al., 2021).

Systematic screening is important for early identification

- Using standardised screening tools and processes during intake can increase the rate at which risk factors and indicators are **captured and systematically recorded** by child welfare workers (Macy, 2018; Pate et al., 2021).
- There is a primary need to **build trust** with young people prior to using tools, as young people are often not initially comfortable disclosing their experiences (Chester, 2018; Lim et al., 2020; Macy, 2018).
  - Perpetrators of exploitation will often escort young people to meetings, so it is important to ensure that children and young people are **spoken to in private** (Macy, 2018).
  - **Specific frameworks** have been developed to support the establishment of trust with children and young people e.g., the England Office of the Children's Commissioner's *See Me, Hear Me* (Lefevre et al., 2017).
- **Several validated tools** for human trafficking screening within the child welfare context exist, although these often include items not well-supported by research (Franklin et al., 2018; Pate et al., 2021).
  - **Human Trafficking Screening Tool** (Dank et al., 2017) is well-supported: Takes 1-2 minutes to complete and captures experiences related to trafficking. Found to be **more useful** in identifying sexual and labour exploitation than a standard psychosocial assessment.

Trauma-informed, multi-disciplinary interventions have strongest evidence base

- Interventions need to incorporate awareness of **complex trauma**, **poly-victimisation**, and the **cyclical nature of recovery** (Lim et al., 2020; McDonald & Middleton, 2019; Macy, 2018).
  - Trauma- informed practice based on Bronfenbrenner's **social ecological framework** is promising and flexible to individual needs
- **Safety planning** is commonly reported as the most important first step when supporting victims of child exploitation (Lim et al., 2020; Macy, 2018).
- Interventions also tend to be more effective when **multi-disciplinary** and managed by a specially trained **care navigator** who consults with a wider team (Burke et al., 2015; Gatwiri et al., 2020; Lim et al., 2020; McKibbin, 2017; Macy, 2018; Nsonwu et al., 2018)
- Comprehensive assessment of needs can be supported by existing **assessment frameworks** e.g., the Vera Institute of Justice Trafficking Victim Identification Tool (Macy, 2018).
- Other **common needs** include (Kotrla, 2010; Lim et al., 2020; Nsonwu et al., 2018):
  - Short- and long-term housing
  - Specialist therapeutic residences
  - Therapeutic foster care
  - Medical care
  - Substance use treatment
  - Trauma-informed mental health services
  - Family reintegration (if safe)
  - Incremental community reintegration

Several key gaps in the child welfare response have been identified

- Research consistently identifies a need for **more specific training** for child welfare workers to identify the signs, symptoms, and appropriate responses to child exploitation (Bounds et al., 2015; Chester, 2018; Lim et al., 2020; Lyons, 2021; McKibbin, 2017; Macy, 2018).
  - Social workers feel more confident following training where it is **practically-focused**, including the development of skills in systematic **needs assessments and investigation skills**, and information about **appropriate referrals** (Lyons, 2021).
  - There is currently a **lack of research** that measures the effectiveness of training for child welfare workers.
- There is also an identified need to build **stronger links and collaboration** between child welfare agencies, other government agencies, and community stakeholders (Fong & Cardoso, 2010; Lyons, 2021; Macias-Konstantopoulos et al., 2015; Pearce, 2014).
  - Acknowledges the **complexity of need** for many young people who have been exploited, or are at risk of being exploited.
  - Needs to be **appropriately resourced** so that immediate and long-term needs of young people can be met collaboratively.
- A **lack of systematic data collection** is also a large barrier to research and practice improvement (Bounds et al., 2015; Gatwiri et al., 2020; Lim et al., 2020).

Labour exploitation

There is a lack of research on child labour exploitation

- There is currently a lack of research on labour exploitation and trafficking of young people, due to **lack of systematic data collection** and comparative **greater focus on sexual exploitation** (Alvarez & Alessi, 2012; Boothby et al., 2012; Greenbaum et al., 2022).
  - In higher-income countries, child labour exploitation is **less common** than child sexual exploitation, but is also **less often detected** (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
  - The focus on sexual exploitation can lead to **stereotyped understandings of exploitation**, and failure to identify 'non-typical' victims e.g., boys (Alvarez & Alessi, 2012).
- Most of what is known comes from international studies, which often focus on developing countries that are **less relevant to the Aotearoa context**.
  - Most of the identified literature also focused on the issue from an **economic or international law perspective**, rather than providing information on appropriate prevention and/or intervention strategies within the child welfare context.

A small number of risk factors have been identified

- **Prior involvement of child welfare agencies** is common among children and young people exploited for labour, particularly for **neglect or physical abuse** (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
  - However, child welfare involvement and childhood physical, sexual and/or psychological abuse **rates were lower** than for victims of child sexual exploitation (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
- Compared to children who are sexually exploited, children and young people involved in labour trafficking may be **younger** and more likely to be **male** (although limited evidence at this point) (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
- Prior **allegations of labour trafficking** are commonly found in the records of exploited children and young people (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
- Some **cross-over with sexual exploitation**, although labour exploitation alone is still common (Greenbaum et al., 2022).

There is a lack of specific, validated screening tools

- No validated screening tools for child labour exploitation exist, but **commonly-reported symptoms** include (Greenbaum et al., 2022):
  - Sleep disturbance
  - Fatigue
  - Weight changes
  - Suicidal ideation
  - Nightmares
  - Intrusive thoughts
  - Avoidance of internal reminders
  - Hypervigilance
  - Concentration problems
  - Somatic (bodily) dysregulation
- Children and young people **may not realise** that they are being exploited for labour, especially where the perpetrator is a friend or family member (Greenbaum et al., 2022).
- Fear of **retaliation or pressure to pay debt bonds** may also cause victims to be reluctant to speak out (Alvarez & Alessi, 2012).
  - **Trauma-informed interviewing** conducted in **private** may help overcome these barriers.

Intervening with child labour exploitation involves multiple levels

- Awareness-raising and participation at **individual, community and policy levels** are important for prevention (Basu & Tzannatos, 2003; Boothby et al., 2012).
- Developing an understanding of the child's situation through **comprehensive assessment** is vital for developing effective, individualised response strategies (Boothby et al., 2012).
- Removing **immediate threats to safety and wellbeing** is the first priority (Boothby et al., 2012).

Sexual exploitation

Child sexual exploitation is a 'hidden' problem

- Victims of CSEC are often reluctant to seek help due to **stigma, shame, fear, or lack of awareness** that they are being exploited (McKibbin & Humphreys, 2019; O'Brien et al., 2022; Okech et al., 2018).
- As such, victims often go **unidentified**, or may be **criminalised or mandated** to engage in programmes or interventions that do not recognise their victimisation (Cole & Sprang, 2020; O'Brien et al., 2022).
  - **'Safe harbour' legislation** in the U.S. that provides alternative justice pathways for suspected victims of exploitation appears to **be improving identification and response** to cases of CSEC (Barnert et al., 2016; Cole & Sprang, 2020; Roby & Vincent, 2017).
- However, there is also an **inherent tension** between the protection of child safety and welfare, and the child's right to voice, privacy and autonomy in cases of CSEC (Hickle & Hallett, 2016; Lefevre et al., 2019; Sapiro et al., 2016; Smith & Woodiwiss, 2016; Reisel, 2017).
  - Ignoring the latter can **alienate** young people experiencing CSEC
  - Providing appropriate **psychological supervision and manageable workloads** can allow child welfare workers the space to engage in child-centred, nuanced practice.

Developing and delivering evidence-based staff training is vital

- Research with social workers has found that CSEC trainings tend to focus more on **risk factors** such as homelessness or SES, rather than addressing its **social and structural factors** e.g., discrimination (Firmin et al., 2016; Gerassi et al., 2022).
- ***Click: Path to Protection*** developed in UK as a pilot training programme for multi-disciplinary teams working with online CSEC (Bond & Dogaru, 2019).
  - An evaluation found significant increases in **practitioner confidence** after the training.
  - Includes how to **respond** to suspected cases, how to **support** children and their supportive caregivers, and how to ensure the response is **family-centred.**
  - Inclusion of 'real life' **case studies and expert facilitators** reported by staff to be the most useful training materials.
- One 90-minute **webinar-based** CSEC training programme for child welfare staff in the U.S. also looks promising (McMahon-Howard & Reimers, 2013)
  - Overall purpose was to train staff **to define, identify and appropriately respond** to CSEC.
  - Evaluation found significant increases in **staff knowledge**, ability to **identify** risk factors, self-willingness to **report** CSEC, and **awareness** of available resources and services.

Several risk factors for CSEC have been identified

- Specific population groups are at heightened risk: children and young **people of colour** (including indigenous populations), children and young people with **LGBTQ+ identities**, those with **learning disabilities**, and **neurodiverse** children and young people (Franklin & Smeaton, 2017; Gatwiri et al., 2020; Gerassi et al., 2022; Gerassi & Pederson, 2022).
  - **Girls** are generally exploited at higher rates, although there is a need to appropriately identify and respond to **boy victims** also (Josenhans et al., 2020; Panlilio et al., 2019).
  - Also **intersectionality** considerations: LGBTQ+ children and young people of colour at greater risk
  - It is vital to ensure that prevention and intervention approaches are **responsive** to the unique needs of these populations.
- **Family dysfunction** also a risk factor, including insecure caregiver attachments, family disruption, and exposure to family violence and parental substance abuse (Brandt et al., 2021; Reid, 2018).
- Although many risk factors for CSEC overlap with risk for other sexual abuse, victims of CSEC tend to have longer histories of **sexual activity** and **drug use**, greater **exposure to violence**, and history of **running away** (Franklin et al., 2018; Panlilio et al., 2019).

Psychoeducational prevention efforts tend to focus on at-risk populations

- Prevention initiatives for CSEC tend to focus on at-risk children and young people (e.g., young people in **residences**), although some general psychoeducational initiatives have been developed for **schools** (Kotrla, 2010; McKibbin, 2017).
  - These initiatives tend to focus on **healthy relationships** and awareness of **CSEC tactics**.
- Existing initiatives often **lack explicit engagement with safe family** members, although some promising **family-centred models** have been developed e.g., UK Barnardo's *Families and Communities against Sexual Exploitation (FCASE)* (Thomas & D'Arcy, 2017):
  - A **6-8 week family-centred intervention** for young people at risk or who have experienced CSEC.
  - **Built on existing models** such as the Common Assessment Framework, the Team around the Child, and Family Group Conferencing.
  - Emphasises the need for **multi-agency processes** to identify and respond to early warning signs.
  - Aims to enhance **familial relationships and functioning**, reduce **risk**, achieve stable **housing**, and build capacity of children and caregivers to **identify risks of CSEC**.
  - **Flexibility, family empowerment,** and **strengths-based** practice seen as key for effectiveness.

My Life, My Choice

- The *My Life, My Choice* exploitation prevention curriculum is a **psychoeducation-based** prevention initiative in the U.S. that was developed from a combination of evidence base with victim experiences (Grace et al., 2018).
  - Originally developed for delivery to **teenage girls.**
- The curriculum has **three primary aims**:
  - **Change attitudes**: reduce teens' perceptions of the commercial sex industry as desirable or glamorous, and increase perceptions of the dangers of the industry.
  - **Change knowledge**: improve teens' understanding of the processes of CSEC (including grooming/recruitment), and what life is like for victims of CSEC.
  - **Change skills**: increase protective factors such as assertiveness and negotiation skills, and awareness of resources and pathways out if they become exploited.
- The curriculum is delivered in **group-based** psychoeducation sessions, facilitated by a **trained clinician** (who can also respond to disclosures).
  - A key focus is building healthy, protective relationships with other peers and safe adults.
  - Delivered in schools, group homes, therapeutic residences, and youth justice facilities.
- Evaluations have found improvements in participant **knowledge, attitudes, and self-esteem**, although no significant impact on knowledge of available resources.
- Similar interventions have been developed in the U.K. – ***Bespoke*** and ***Bewise2 Sexual Exploitation*** (McKibbin, 2017).

Residences provide opportunities for prevention

- Due to their high-risk nature, **residential care settings** also provide opportunities for prevention initiatives (Gatwiri et al., 2020; Grace et al., 2018; Kotrla, 2010; McKibbin & Humphreys, 2019; Pearce, 2014; Reid, 2018). These can include:
  - Educating children and young people about **common grooming tactics**.
  - Developing skills in **emotional regulation**, to help prevent runaways.
  - **Training** for residential care workers in recognising and preventing sexual exploitation, and practicing **trauma-informed care**.
  - Upskilling residential care workers to provide environments where children and young people feel **safe to disclose** grooming and harmful sexual behaviour.
  - Creating **safety plans** specific to CSEC at intake.
- Creating **positive environments** in out-of-home care can also help to prevent runaways, and consequent CSEC risk (Sapiro et al., 2016).
  - Interviews with previous CSEC victims suggested they preferred **unsecured, smaller home-like** settings that were closer to their families, although these smaller residences often **lacked the activities and programming** available in larger settings (Dierkhising et al., 2020).
  - **Specialist foster homes** for children and young people at risk or who have experienced CSEC have also been trialled in the U.K., although evaluation of outcomes has been limited (Shuker, 2015)

Respecting Sexual Safety

- **Residential care-based** programme to prevent CSEC in Victoria, Australia, being trialled in three residences (McKibbin et al., 2022).
- Designed as a **secondary prevention** effort (i.e., aimed at high-risk young people).
- Comprises **three prevention strategies**:
  - **Whole-of-house respectful relationships and sexuality education**: residential carers are coached to create environments that reflect and support gender equality and respectful relationships, and trained in how to respond to sexual health and safety needs. Also includes therapeutic life story work with all young people.
  - **Missing from home strategy**: enhancing quality of relationships between carers and children, to build protection against young people running away from residence. Each young person assigned a key worker and several sub-workers, and a smartphone, to support connection 24/7.
  - **Sexual safety response**: residential carers trained in the use of a framework to help recognise the early signs of problematic sexual behaviour, and engage in safety planning. Includes direct support and advice from local harmful sexual behaviour services and clinicians/experts.

Respecting Sexual Safety cont'd

- The intervention is currently at a pilot stage, but some **early challenges** have been identified (McKibbin et al., 2022):
  - Balancing the **multiple priorities and considerations** of the different organisations involved, including government and non-government organisations. **Requires integration** of these different initiatives.
  - The policy culture in Victoria **prioritises tertiary prevention** (i.e., intervention with perpetrators) over early intervention.
  - Residential carers often **experience disempowerment and distress** when a child or young person leaves the home and there is strong suspicion of sexual exploitation. There is a need for **more focus on training** carers for in-the-moment responses that may help to prevent the young person from leaving the home, rather than only identifying risk and reporting to case managers and practice leaders.

A variety of screening tools are available to identify CSEC

- Wide variety of tools is being used, often adapted to the **local context**, but often a conflation between use for **screening vs assessment** (Franklin et al., 2018).
- Mostly **widely-used tools** include the Commercial Sexual Exploitation Identification Tool (CSE-IT; Basson, 2017) and Greenbaum et al.'s (2018) measure to identify youth at risk for CSEC.
  - Some **stepped tools** also developed, whereby all youth are screened with a smaller number of items at intake, and then a larger screener is used where risk is initially identified e.g., Screening Questionnaire for the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Youth (Brandt et al., 2021).
- **Sexual Exploitation among Youth (SEY)** screener also promising (Panlilio et al., 2022).
  - Scored by **social workers** using social history information, during intake, and from other available sources (e.g., social media).
  - Validated with wellbeing survey data from child protection-involved young people, but showed **good ability to distinguish** between young people at high and low risk of CSEC
  - Currently used across **Manitoba, Canada.**
- Some **machine learning/algorithm-based** assessment tools are also being developed (e.g., de Vries et al., 2020).

Support of LGBTQ+ young people an important consideration

- **Inclusive and affirming responses** are required for LGBTQ+ children and young people at risk of CSEC (Gatwiri et al., 2020; Gerassi & Pederson, 2022).
  - Guided by **established policies and practices** that support people with diverse genders and sexualities, and acknowledge intersectional identities.
- Workers' **lack of familiarity** with relevant terminology, inclusive language, and concepts relevant to LGBTQ+ experiences (e.g., identity fluidity) can be a barrier to help-seeking (Gerassi & Pederson, 2022).
  - Requiring LGBTQ+ young people to disclose their identities also seen as a **barrier to help-seeking**. Instead, space should be made for children or young people to disclose when they feel comfortable
- Prevention initiatives should also reflect **perspectives, stories and experiences** of LGBTQ+ youth (Gerassi & Pederson, 2022).
- **Targeted and accessible intervention services** also need to be made available e.g., housing services, residential victim support programmes (Gerassi & Pederson, 2022).

A range of interventions are offered to CSEC victims

- Common components of **specialised CSEC treatment approaches** include victim/survivor mentorship, therapeutic groups, intensive case management, vocational training, multi-systemic therapy, and connections to specialist health care providers (Fong & Cardoso, 2010; O'Brien et al., 2022; Okech et al., 2018).
  - In general, effective interventions are **trauma-informed**, and emphasise **holistic models of treatment** that incorporate family, friends, community, and schools.
  - Comprehensive **aftercare is generally lacking** for victims/survivors of CSEC.
- Initiatives for responding to CSEC are relatively new and **lack a strong evidence base** (Bounds et al., 2015; Felner & DuBois, 2017; O'Brien et al., 2022).
- Due to the limited evidence base, youth programmes that have found to be effective for **addressing issues that often co-occur** with CSEC may provide promising directions for CSEC intervention efforts (Jordan et al., 2013; O'Brien et al., 2022).
  - **Co-occurring problems** include substance use, absconding, homelessness, difficulties with school, antisocial behaviour, mental/physical health issues, and other adverse childhood experiences, including sexual abuse and physical abuse or neglect.

Several barriers to timely and effective intervention exist

- **Normalisation or glamorisation** of CSEC, leading to victims not self-identifying as victims (Firmin et al., 2016; Hickle & Hallett, 2016; Jordan et al., 2013; McKibbin, 2017; O'Brien et al., 2022)
- **Stereotyping and stigmatisation** of victims of exploitation, including by child welfare workers (Gatwiri et al., 2020; Jordan et al., 2013; Lyons, 2021; McMahon-Howard & Reimers, 2013; Pearce, 2014).
- **Threats** towards family/friends, or **social isolation** (O'Brien et al., 2022).
- Belief that **financial and other basic needs** are met through exploitation (Hickle & Hallett, 2016; O'Brien et al., 2022).
- Lack of **familial involvement** in intervention efforts (O'Brien et al., 2022).
  - Some alternatives that have demonstrated efficacy where **family involvement is low** include peer mentorship, whānau foster care, or residential treatment.
- Lack of **standardised approaches** to identification (Chester, 2018).
- Lack of **awareness, training and resourcing** of child welfare staff (Chester, 2018; Gatwiri et al., 2020; Lyons, 2021; Macy, 2018).

Extended review

Much is still unknown about child labour exploitation

- There is a recurring theme in the literature that a comparative emphasis on the sexual exploitation of children has left a **gap in our understanding** of child labour exploitation (Cockbain et al., 2018; Dowling et al., 2007; Farrell & Pfeffer, 2014; Gibbs et al., 2020; Machura et al., 2018).
- Although there are likely to be differences in important indicators, much of the existing information on indicators of labour exploitation has been **derived from research on sexual exploitation** (Dowling et al., 2007).
- There is currently a **lack of understanding of even 'basic' facets** of child labour exploitation, including characteristics of victims, the most common forms of labour exploitation, and differences in the nature of labour exploitation across employment sectors (Burt, 2019; Dowling et al., 2007; Gibbs et al., 2020).

Labour exploitation occurs in a range of employment sectors

- Child labour exploitation occurs in **both legal and illegal industries**, including agriculture, manufacturing, beauty industries, food service industries, domestic work, travelling sales crews, and drug trafficking (Bachrach et al., 2022; Burt, 2019; Dottridge, 2021; Dowling et al., 2007; Geddes et al., 2013; Gibbs et al., 2020).
  - In the **agriculture industry** (often cited as the most dangerous industry for children), child laborers may be exposed to: dangerous machinery; tools and chemicals; confined spaces; work at height; long working hours; livestock; and excessive noise (Fuller, 2019; Human Rights Watch, 2010).
  - In the **retail and food industry**, child laborers may be exposed to: working alone or during off-peak hours (raising risks of robbery); cuts; and burns from cooking equipment (Fuller, 2019).
- **Specific examples** of known child labour exploitation situations include:
  - Working in restaurants for long hours and/or on low wages, with requests for improved working conditions met with harsh retaliation (Burt, 2019).
  - Working on cannabis farms or other drug manufacturing operations (Dottridge, 2021; Machura et al., 2018).
  - Working in nail bars in exchange for accommodation/upkeep, creating debt bonds (Dottridge, 2021; Machura et al., 2018).
  - Domestic servitude enforced by an insecure immigration status (Dwyer et al., 2011).
  - Working adult hours in agriculture during summers, weekends, or after school, typically from the age of 11 or 12 (Human Rights Watch, 2010).

Exploiters use a range of tactics to maintain control of victims

- A variety of tactics are used to **manipulate or control** victims of labour exploitation, including (Burt, 2019; Cockbain et al., 2018; Dottridge, 2021; Dowling et al., 2007; Dwyer et al., 2011; Farrell et al., 2012; Farrell & Pfeffer, 2014; Geddes et al., 2013; Letsie et al., 2021):
  - promises of improved conditions/wages
  - withholding pay
  - debt bondage
  - confiscation of identity documents
  - threats to report to authorities
  - drugging
  - normalising exploitation behaviours
  - isolation
- **Physical and sexual assaults**, and **detainment** (or threats of these) may also be used to control victims (Burt, 2019; Cockbain et al., 2018; Gibbs et al., 2020; Letsie et al., 2021; Turner-Moss et al., 2014).
  - These acts can **psychologically damage** victims, who may come to believe that they deserve or have caused their abuse.

Labour exploitation often leads to engagement with health providers

- There is **limited information on robust indicators** of child labour exploitation.
  - Labour exploitation is often not as distinctive as sexual exploitation, allowing it to become more **enmeshed and invisible** in communities (Burt, 2019).
  - It is also common for victims of child labour exploitation to have **limited contact with communities** outside of their abusers, limiting opportunities for detection (Dottrige, 2021; Dwyer et al., 2011; Farrell & Pfeffer, 2014).
- That said, the poor living and work conditions often lead victims to **interact with health providers**, highlighting the value of routine screening in these environments (Bachrach et al., 2022; Burt, 2019; Cockbain et al., 2018; Greenbaum, 2016; Human Rights Watch, 2010; Maioli et al., 2021; Turner-Moss et al., 2014).
  - Common **presenting symptoms** include: PTSD symptoms; injuries related to physical or sexual assault, or imprisonment; work-related injuries; untreated medical issues; malnutrition; memory difficulties; heat illnesses; or exhaustion.
  - **Occupational injuries** that indicate unsafe work environments, as well as the presence of multiple injuries in **varied stages of healing**, are additional indicators.
  - Victims of exploitation may appear to be in a **hurry**, or **leave** against medical advice.

Professionals may identify a range of other indicators of risk

- Other **potential indicators** of child labour exploitation that may be detected by professionals include (Burt, 2019; Fuller, 2019; Greenbaum, 2016):
  - **Disconnection** from friends, family, or community, including school truancy
  - **Confused, disoriented, or submissive** presentation
  - Extreme amounts of **dependence** on, or **subservience** to, caregivers
  - Having **limited information** about where they live, their living arrangements, and their personal finances
  - **Dissociation or inconsistencies** when reporting personal history
  - Accounts of **overly-restrictive** living arrangements (e.g., bars on windows, or security cameras) and **harsh consequences** for rule-breaking
  - Overly **'coached'** or **memorised** speech or responses to professionals
  - Lack of **personal possessions** or basic items e.g., appropriate clothing and shoes
  - Extremely **fearful or paranoid** around people, with specific panic or alarm about **police**

Adult labour exploitation screening tools may be suitable for children

- Although further validation research is required, several **adult exploitation tools** exist that may be suitable to screen for child exploitation, with adaptation:
  - The **Trafficking Victimization Identification Tool** (TVIT; Simich et al., 2014) is a screening tool for both sexual and labour exploitation that comes in short (16 items) and long forms (30 items).
  - The **Comprehensive Human Trafficking Assessment** (CHTA; National Human Trafficking Resource Center) is a 52-item self-report tool that assesses different aspects of trafficking, including debt-monetary matters, coercion, and labour trafficking.
  - The **Rapid Appraisal for Trafficking** (RAFT; Chisolm-Straker et al., 2021) is a 4-item brief labour and sexual exploitation screening tool, for use in social services settings.
  - The **Human Trafficking Screening Tool** (HTST; Dank et al., 2017) is a 19-item questionnaire that screens for both sexual and labour exploitation in social work, runaway and young adult settings. A 6-item short form version is also available.
- It is recommended that screening tools screen for **both sexual and labour exploitation** simultaneously, as screening only for one may lead to the under-detection of the other (Burt, 2019; Chisolm-Straker et al., 2021).

Migrants are highly vulnerable to child labour exploitation

- A large majority of victims of labour exploitation in the U.S. are **non-citizens** (Farrell et al., 2012; Letsie et al., 2021), however there is **limited research** that explores the nature and prevention of labour exploitation for child migrants or refugees.
  - Instead, most existing research **focuses on adult migrant labour exploitation**, although this is also limited and further research is needed.
- Children trafficked across borders for the purposes of labour exploitation may be **accompanied or unaccompanied**, and many will have false passports with altered dates of birth (Dowling et al., 2007).
  - Unaccompanied minors are generally at **higher risk** of labour exploitation than adult migrants (Maioli et al., 2021; van de Glind, 2010).
- Immigration policy can inadvertently create conditions for the exploitation of migrant labour through the removal of **labour rights and protections** in labour migration programmes, and restrictive labour market **mobility policies** (Åhlberg & Granada, 2022; Dowling et al., 2007; Maioli et al., 2021).

Certain groups of migrants are at higher risk of labour exploitation

- The different conditions faced by different groups of migrants lead to what is called the **'hierarchy of vulnerability'** to exploitation (Åhlberg & Granada, 2022; Dywer et al., 2011).
- Migrants and their children living in a country **illegally** or **beyond the conditions of their visa** are at a high risk of labour exploitation due to having fewer employment options, restricted employment rights, and barriers to reporting abuse, such as fear of legal repercussions (Åhlberg & Granada, 2022; Dowling et al., 2007; Dwyer et al., 2011; Geddes et al., 2013; Human Rights Watch, 2010; Loyens & Paracian, 2023; van de Glind, 2010).
  - Implementing **punitive immigration policies** that restrict social and legal rights for these migrants, or enforcing complex conditions for maintaining visa status, can exacerbate this issue.
  - It is also important that children have **access to education, health** and other **social services** regardless of their or their parents' immigration status.
- Creating **clear, regular routes** into low-skilled jobs for migrants can help to reduce the factors that draw some migrants into entering a country illegally, or living beyond the conditions of their visa (Åhlberg & Granada, 2022; Dwyer et al., 2011; van de Glind, 2010).

Friends and romantic partners are the most common CSEC recruiters

- **Friends and romantic partners** are the most common recruiters of children into sexual exploitation (Baird & Connolly, 2023; Puigvert et al., 2021; Reed et al., 2019).
- **Family members**, including fathers, mothers, siblings, foster parents, and step-parents, are also frequently found to recruit young people into CSEC (Baird & Connolly, 2023; Puigvert et al., 2021).
  - Some research has suggested that **mothers** are the most common family member to recruit a young person into CSEC (Baird & Connolly, 2023; Reed et al., 2019).
  - Family members tend to use parental authority, family loyalty, and/or force to **recruit their victims**.
- Familial relationship with recruiters **appears to differ** depending on the characteristics of the victim (Baird & Connolly, 2023).
  - **Rural** and/or **younger victims** more likely to be recruited by family members.
  - **Urban** and/or **teenage victims** more likely to be recruited by friends or romantic partners.
- Having family members who are **involved in sex work**, or friends who have bought sex, may also increase the risk of child sexual exploitation (Fedina et al., 2019; Puigvert et al., 2021; Reed et al., 2019).
  - Romantic partners responsible for recruitment also commonly have family members involved in sex work or sex trafficking (Puigvert et al., 2021).

Most child labour exploitation victims know their exploiter

- **Less is known** about the relationship between perpetrators and victims in child labour exploitation cases.
- One small study indicated that most victims of child labour exploitation in their U.S. sample reported **some prior relationship** with their exploiter, with just over half being acquaintances (Letsie et al., 2021).
  - That said, around a third of exploiters were **complete strangers** to the victim.
  - **Family members** were infrequently identified as the primary exploiters.
- Engagement with the **child welfare system** tends to be more common among child victims of sexual exploitation as opposed to labour exploitation (Gibbs et al., 2020).

Religious organisations can play an important role in child protection

- Many religious organisations **partner with established secular prevention initiatives**, such as United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and Save the Children, to help address child exploitation (Bunge, 2014; Hanmer, 2010).
- Religious organisations also **lead initiatives**, including advocacy work, targeted service delivery, referral pathways, and establishing child-friendly spaces in communities (McLeigh & Taylor, 2020; Robinson & Hanmer, 2014).
  - Religious organisations also **indirectly prevent child exploitation** through the delivery of social support initiatives, which reduce community and family risk factors for exploitation (McLeigh & Taylor, 2020; Melton & Anderson, 2008; Robinson & Hanmer, 2014).
- Religious organisations can be particularly effective in **influencing community norms and dialogue** that can assist with child exploitation prevention and identification (Hanmer, 2010; McLeigh & Taylor, 2020; Melton & Anderson, 2008; Robinson & Hanmer, 2014).
  - They can also assist with **engaging with families** that may not have contact with government organisations, and provide long-term relationships and support.
- It is important that **child welfare agencies work alongside religious organisations** to ensure that they have access to guidance on current best practice for child protection, and that there is a shared vision for combined efforts in this space (Hanmer, 2010; McLeigh & Taylor, 2020; Robinson & Hanmer, 2014).

Bibliography

Bibliography – original review

- Alvarez, M. B., & Alessi, E. J. (2012). Human trafficking is more than sex trafficking and prostitution: Implications for social work. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work, 27*(2), 142-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109912443763
- Barnert, E. S., Abrams, S., Azzi, V. F., Ryan, G., Brook, R., & Chung, P. J. (2016). Identifying best practices for 'Safe Harbor' legislation to protect child sex trafficking victims: Decriminalization alone is not sufficient. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 51*, 249-262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.002
- Basson, D. (2017). *Validation of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation-Identification Tool (CSE-IT).* Technical Report for WestCoast Children's Clinic. Retrieved from www.westcoastcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/WCC-CSE-IT-PilotReport-FINAL.pdf
- Basu, A. K., & Chau, N. H. (2007). An exploration of the worst forms of child labor: Is redemption a viable option? In K. A. Appiah & M. Bunzl (Eds.), *Buying freedom: The ethics and economics of slave redemption,* 37-76. Princeton University Press.
- Basu, K., & Tzannatos, Z. (2003). The global child labor problem: What do we know and what can we do? [Article]. *World Bank Economic Review, 17*(2), 147-173. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhg021
- Bond, E., & Dogaru, C. (2019). An Evaluation of an Inter-Disciplinary Training Programme for Professionals to Support Children and Their Families Who Have Been Sexually Abused Online. *British Journal of Social Work, 49*(3), 577-594. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcy075
- Boothby, N., Wessells, M., Williamson, J., Huebner, G., Canter, K., Rolland, E. G., Kutlesic, V., Bader, F., Diaw, L., Levine, M., Malley, A., Michels, K., Patel, S., Rasa, T., Ssewamala, F., & Walker, V. (2012). What are the most effective early response strategies and interventions to assess and address the immediate needs of children outside of family care? *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(10), 711-721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.09.004
- Bounds, D., Julion, W. A., & Delaney, K. R. (2015). Commercial sexual exploitation of children and state child welfare systems. *Policy, Politics, & Nursing Practice, 16*(1-2), 17-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527154415583124
- Bourdillon, M., & Carothers, R. (2019). Policy on Children's Work and Labour. *Children & Society, 33*(4), 387-395. https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12313
- Brandt, T. W., Lind, T., Schreier, A., Sievers, C. M., & Kramer, T. L. (2021). Identifying Youth at Risk for Commercial Sexual Exploitation Within Child Advocacy Centers: A Statewide Pilot Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5/6), NP2368-NP2390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518766560
- Burke, M., McCauley, H. L., Rackow, A., Orsini, B., Simunovic, B., & Miller, E. (2015). Implementing a Coordinated Care Model for Sex Trafficked Minors in Smaller Cities. *Journal of Applied Research on Children, 6*(1), 1-13.
- Chester, S. (2017). *Domestic minor sex trafficking and social work practice*. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. 3597. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/3597
- Choi, K. R. (2015). Risk factors for domestic minor sex trafficking in the United States: A literature review. *Journal of Forensic Nursing, 11*(2), 66-76. https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0000000000000072

Bibliography – original review

- Cole, J., & Sprang, G. (2020). Post-implementation of a Safe Harbor law in the US: Review of state administrative data. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 101*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104320
- Dank, M. L., Yahner, J., Yu, L., Vasquez-Noriega, C., Gelatt, J., Pergamit, M. R., & Center, J. P. (2017). *Pretesting a human trafficking screening tool in the child welfare and runaway and homeless youth systems.* Report for Urban Institute. Retrieved from https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/migrated_legacy_files/176876/Pretesting.pdf
- Dastbaz, M., & Halpin, E. (2014). Chapter 11 - ICT as a protection tool against child exploitation. In B. Akhgar, A. Staniforth, & F. Bosco (Eds.), *Cyber Crime and Cyber Terrorism Investigator's Handbook,* 133-147. Syngress. www.bbau.ac.in/dept/Law/TM/9.pdf
- de Vries, I., Kafafian, M., Goggin, K., Bouchard, E., Goldfarb, S., & Farrell, A. (2020). Enhancing the Identification of Commercial Sexual Exploitation Among a Population of High-Risk Youths Using Predictive Regularization Models. *Child Maltreatment, 25*(3), 318-327. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559519889178
- Dessy, S. E., & Vencatachellum, D. (2003). Explaining cross-country differences in policy response to child labour [Article]. *Canadian Journal of Economics, 36*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5982.00001
- Dierkhising, C. B., Walker Brown, K., Ackerman-Brimberg, M., & Newcombe, A. (2020). Recommendations to improve out of home care from youth who have experienced commercial sexual exploitation. *Children & Youth Services Review, 116*, 105263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105263
- Felner, J., & DuBois, D. (2017). Addressing the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth: A Systematic Review of Program and Policy Evaluations. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 10*(2), 187-201. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-016-0103-2
- Firmin, C., Warrington, C., & Pearce, J. (2016). Sexual Exploitation and Its Impact on Developing Sexualities and Sexual Relationships: The Need for Contextual Social Work Interventions. *British Journal of Social Work, 46*(8), 2318-2337. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw134
- Fong, R., & Berger Cardoso, J. (2010, 2010/08/01/). Child human trafficking victims: Challenges for the child welfare system. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 33*(3), 311-316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.06.018
- Franklin, A., Brown, S., & Brady, G. (2018). The use of tools and checklists to assess the risk of child sexual exploitation: Lessons from UK practice. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse: Research, Treatment, & Program Innovations for Victims, Survivors, & Offenders, 27*(8), 978-997. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2018.1510453
- Franklin, A., & Smeaton, E. (2017). Recognising and responding to young people with learning disabilities who experience, or are at risk of, child sexual exploitation in the UK. *Children and Youth Services Review, 73*, 474-481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.11.009
- Gatwiri, K., Cameron, N., McPherson, L., & Parmenter, N. (2020). What is known about child sexual exploitation in residential care in Australia? A systematic scoping review. *Children and Youth Services Review, 116*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105188
- Gerassi, L. B., Klein, L. B., & Rosales, M. d. C. (2022). Moving Toward Critical Consciousness and Anti-Oppressive Practice Approaches With People at Risk of Sex Trafficking: Perspectives From Social Service Providers. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work, 37*(3), 431-447. https://doi.org/10.1177/08861099211025531

Bibliography – original review

- Gerassi, L. B., & Pederson, A. C. (2022). Social Service Providers' Knowledge of and Practice with LGBTQ+ People at Risk of Sex Trafficking. *Social Work Research, 46*(2), 101-114. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svac001
- Grace, L. G., Bright, K., Corbett, A., & Morrissey, A. (2018). Preventing the commercial sexual exploitation of children: The My Life My Choice model. In A. J. Nichols, T. Edmond, & E. C. Heil (Eds.), *Social work practice with survivors of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation,* 335-357. Columbia University Press.
- Greenbaum, J., Sprang, G., Recknor, F., Harper, N. S., & Titchen, K. (2022). Labor trafficking of children and youth in the United States: A scoping review [Article]. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 131*, Article 105694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2022.105694
- Hickle, K., & Hallett, S. (2016). Mitigating Harm: Considering Harm Reduction Principles in Work with Sexually Exploited Young People. *Children & Society, 30*(4), 302-313. https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12145
- Jordan, J., Patel, B., & Rapp, L. (2013). Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: A Social Work Perspective on Misidentification, Victims, Buyers, Traffickers, Treatment, and Reform of Current Practice. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 23*(3), 356-369. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2013.764198
- Josenhans, V., Kavenagh, M., Smith, S., & Wekerle, C. (2020, 2020/12/01/). Gender, rights and responsibilities: The need for a global analysis of the sexual exploitation of boys. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 110*, 104291. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104291
- Kotrla, K. (2010). Domestic minor sex trafficking in the United States. *Social Work, 55*(2), 181-187. https://doi.org/sw/55.2.181
- Latzman, N. E., Gibbs, D. A., Feinberg, R., Kluckman, M. N., & Aboul-Hosn, S. (2019). Human trafficking victimization among youth who run away from foster care. *Children & Youth Services Review, 98*, 113-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.12.022
- Lefevre, M., Hickle, K., & Luckock, B. (2019). 'Both/And' Not 'Either/Or': Reconciling Rights to Protection and Participation in Working with Child Sexual Exploitation. *British Journal of Social Work, 49*(7), 1837-1855. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcy106
- Lefevre, M., Hickle, K., Luckock, B., & Ruch, G. (2017). Building Trust with Children and Young People at Risk of Child Sexual Exploitation: The Professional Challenge. *British Journal of Social Work, 47*(8), 2456-2473. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw181
- Lim, C., Bolland, A., Guzzo, D., Higgins, M., Trull, V., & Williams, J. (Fall 2020). Human trafficking and child welfare: A discussion of advocacy, promising practices, and implications. *Best Practices in Mental Health: An International Journal, 16*(2), 21-39.
- Lyons, A. (2021). *Child welfare assessments with human trafficking victims: An action research study.* [Doctoral dissertation, Capella University].
- Macias-Konstantopoulos, W. L., Munroe, D., Purcell, G., Tester, K., Burke, T. F., & Ahn, R. (2015). The Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking of Minors in the Boston Metropolitan Area: Experiences and Challenges Faced by Front-Line Providers and Other Stakeholders. *Journal of Applied Research on Children,* 6(1), 1-21.

Bibliography – original review

- Macy, R. J. (2018). Identification, assessment, and outreach. In A. J. Nichols, T. Edmond, & E. C. Heil (Eds.), *Social work practice with survivors of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation,* 18-32. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/nich18092-003
- Mansoor, F. Z. (2006). Exploitation of child domestic labourers: The limits of the current law. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law, 8*(3), 169-189. https://doi.org/10.1177/135822910600800303
- McDonald, A. R., & Middleton, J. (2019). Applying a survival sex hierarchy to the commercial sexual exploitation of children: a trauma-informed perspective. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 13*(3), 245-264. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2019.1590289
- McKibbin, G. (2017). Preventing harmful sexual behaviour and child sexual exploitation for children & young people living in residential care: A scoping review in the Australian context. *Children and Youth Services Review, 82*, 373-382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.10.008
- McKibbin, G., Halfpenny, N., & Humphreys, C. (2022). Respecting sexual safety: A program to prevent sexual exploitation and harmful sexual behaviour in out-of-home care. *Australian Social Work, 75*(1), 111-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2019.1597910
- McKibbin, G., & Humphreys, C. (2019). The Perceptions of Australian Workers about Caring for Sexually Exploited Children in Residential Care. *Child Abuse Review, 28*(6), 418-430. https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2564
- McMahon-Howard, J., & Reimers, B. (2013). An evaluation of a child welfare training program on the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC). *Evaluation and Program Planning, 40*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2013.04.002
- Nsonwu, M., Heffron, L. C., Welch-Brewer, C., & Busch-Armendariz, N. B. (2018). Supporting sex-trafficking survivors through a collaborative single-point-of-contact model: Mezzo and micro considerations. In A. J. Nichols, T. Edmond, & E. C. Heil (Eds.), *Social work practice with survivors of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation,* 316-332. Columbia University Press.
- O'Brien, J., Finkelhor, D., & Jones, L. (2022). Improving services for youth survivors of commercial sexual exploitation: Insights from interventions with other high-risk youth. *Children & Youth Services Review, 132*, 106313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106313
- Okech, D., Choi, Y. J., Elkins, J., & Burns, A. C. (2018). Seventeen years of human trafficking research in social work: A review of the literature. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work, 15*(2), 103-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2017.1415177
- Panlilio, C. C., Dierkhising, C. B., Richardson, J., & Runner, J. (2022). Evaluating and Validating the Classification Accuracy of a Screening Instrument to Assess Risk for Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Child Welfare–Involved Children and Adolescents. *Public Health Reports, 137*, 73S-82S. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549211065523
- Panlilio, C. C., Miyamoto, S., Font, S. A., & Schreier, H. M. C. (2019). Assessing risk of commercial sexual exploitation among children involved in the child welfare system. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 87*, 88-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.07.021

Bibliography – original review

- Pate, S. S., Anderson, V. R., Kulig, T. C., Wilkes, N., & Sullivan, C. J. (2021). Learning from child welfare case narratives: A directed content analysis of indicators for human trafficking. *Children & Youth Services Review, 121*, Article 105838. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105838
- Pearce, J. J. (2014). 'What's Going On' to Safeguard Children and Young People from Child Sexual Exploitation: A Review of Local Safeguarding Children Boards' Work to Protect Children from Sexual Exploitation. *Child Abuse Review, 23*(3), 159-170. https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2269
- Perdue, T., Prior, M., Williamson, C., & Sherman, S. (Winter 2012). Social justice and spiritual healing: Using micro and macro social work practice to reduce domestic minor sex trafficking. *Social Work & Christianity, 39*(4), 449-465.
- Reid, J. A. (2018). System failure! Is the Department of Children and Families facilitating sex trafficking of foster girls? In A. J. Nichols, T. Edmond, & E. C. Heil (Eds.), *Social work practice with survivors of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation*, 296-315. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/nich18092-015
- Reisel, A. (2017). Practitioners' perceptions and decision-making regarding child sexual exploitation - a qualitative vignette study. *Child & Family Social Work, 22*(3), 1292-1301. https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12346
- Roby, J. L., & Vincent, M. (2017). Federal and State Responses to Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: The Evolution of Policy. *Social Work, 62*(3), 201-209. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx026
- Sapiro, B., Johnson, L., Postmus, J. L., & Simmel, C. (2016). Supporting youth involved in domestic minor sex trafficking: Divergent perspectives on youth agency. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 58*, 99-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.06.019
- Shuker, L. E. (2015). Safe foster care for victims of child sexual exploitation. *Safer Communities, 14*(1), 37-46. https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-03-2015-0006
- Simich, L., Goyen, L., Powell, A., & Mallozzi, K. (2014). *Improving human trafficking victim identification: Validation and dissemination of a screening tool*. Technical report for Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from www.vera.org/downloads/publications/human-trafficking-identification-tool-technical-report.pdf
- Smith, M., & Woodiwiss, J. (2016). Sexuality, Innocence and Agency in Narratives of Childhood Sexual Abuse: Implications for Social Work. *British Journal of Social Work, 46*(8), 2173-2189. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw160
- Thomas, R., & D'Arcy, K. (2017). Combatting Child Sexual Exploitation with Young People and Parents: Contributions to a Twenty-First-Century Family Support Agenda. *British Journal of Social Work, 47*(6), 1686-1703. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcx093
- Turner-Moss, E. (2013). Child labour must be on the post-2015 agenda. *The Lancet, 382*(9910), e52-e53. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61975-3
- Valdovinos, M. G., Thomas, R. L., Tredinnick, L. N., & Reyes, M. V. (2020). Human Trafficking Efforts to Protect Connecticut's Vulnerable Children and Youth: Incorporating the Voices of Community Practitioners. *Violence & Victims, 35*(3), 382-399. https://doi.org/10.1891/VV-D-19-00075
- Wade, G. (2020). Child sexual abuse: A critical analysis of social workers' role in recognising and responding to it. *British Journal of Child Health, 1*(1), 26-33. https://doi.org/10.12968/chhe.2020.1.1.26

Bibliography – extended review

- Åhlberg, M., & Granada, L. (2022). The making of irregular migration: post-Brexit immigration policy and risk of labour exploitation. *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*, *30*(2), 120-140.
- Bachrach, L., Truschel, L., & Chisolm-Straker, M. (2022). Human trafficking of children and adolescents: Recognition and response in the emergency department. *Pediatric Emergency Medicine Practice*, *19*(7), 1-24.
- Baird, K., & Connolly, J. (2023). Recruitment and Entrapment Pathways of Minors into Sex Trafficking in Canada and the United States: A Systematic Review. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, *24*(1), 189-202. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211025241
- Brunovskis, A. (2022). Identification work: Ambivalence, qualms and resistance in social workers' identification of trafficking victims. *International Social Work*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208728221126263
- Bunge, M. J. (2014). The positive role of religion and religious communities in child protection. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(4), 562-566. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.03.013
- Burt, I. (2018). Modern-Day Slavery in the U.S.: Human Trafficking and Counselor Awareness. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *41*(2), 187-200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-9366-7
- Chisolm-Straker, M., Singer, E., Strong, D., Loo, G. T., Rothman, E. F., Clesca, C., d'Etienne, J., Alanis, N., & Richardson, L. D. (2021). Validation of a screening tool for labor and sex trafficking among emergency department patients. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open*, *2*(5), e12558. https://doi.org/10.1002/emp2.12558
- Cockbain, E., Bowers, K., & Dimitrova, G. (2018). Human trafficking for labour exploitation: the results of a two-phase systematic review mapping the European evidence base and synthesising key scientific research evidence. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *14*(3), 319-360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-017-9321-3
- Dottridge, M. (2021). Between Theory and Reality: The challenge of distinguishing between trafficked children and independent child migrants. *Anti-Trafficking Review*(16), 11-27. https://doi.org/10.14197/atr.201221162
- Dowling, S., Moreton, K., & Wright, L. (2007). *Trafficking for the purposes of labour exploitation: A literature review*.
- Dwyer, P., Lewis, H., Scullion, L., & Waite, L. (2011). *Forced labour and UK immigration policy: status matters?*
- Farrell, A., Owens, C., McDevitt, J., Dank, M., Pfeffer, R., Adams, W., & Fahy, S. (2012). *Identifying challenges to improve the investigation and prosecution of state and local human trafficking cases*.
- Farrell, A., & Pfeffer, R. (2014). Policing human trafficking: Cultural blinders and ogranizational barriers. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 653*(1), 46-64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716213515835
- Fedina, L., Williamson, C., & Perdue, T. (2019). Risk Factors for Domestic Child Sex Trafficking in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *34*(13), 2653-2673. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516662306
- Fuller, T. P. (2019). Child labor. In *Global Occupational Safety and Health Management Handbook*, 253-274. CRC Press.

Bibliography – extended review

- Geddes, A., Craig, G., Scott, S., Ackers, L., Robinson, O., & Scullion, D. (2013). *Forced labour in the UK*.
- Gibbs, D. A., Aboul-Hosn, S., & Kluckman, M. N. (2020). Child Labor Trafficking within The US: A First Look at Allegations Investigated by Florida's Child Welfare Agency. *Journal of Human Trafficking*, 6(4), 435-449. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322705.2019.1594551
- Greenbaum, J. (2016). Identifying Victims of Human Trafficking in the Emergency Department. *Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine*, *17*(4), 241-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpem.2016.09.006
- Hainaut, M., Thompson, K. J., Ha, C. J., Herzog, H. L., Roberts, T., & Ades, V. (2022). Are Screening Tools for Identifying Human Trafficking Victims in Health Care Settings Validated? A Scoping Review. *Public Health Rep*, *137*(1_suppl), 63S-72S. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549211061774
- Hanmer, S. (2010). Child rights organizations and religious communities: Powerful partnerships for children. *CrossCurrents*, *60*(3), 451-461.
- Human Rights Watch. (2010). *Fields of peril: Child labor in US agriculture*.
- Letsie, N. C., Lul, B., & Roe-Sepowitz, D. (2021). An eight-year analysis of child labor trafficking cases in the United States: Exploring characteristics, and patterns of child labor trafficking. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *121*, 105265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105265
- Loyens, K., & Paraciani, R. (2021). Who is the ("Ideal") Victim of Labor Exploitation? Two Qualitative Vignette Studies on Labor Inspectors' Discretion. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *64*(1), 27-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2021.1974321
- Machura, S., Short, F., Hill, V. M., Suddaby, C. R., Goddard, F. E., Jones, S. E., Lloyd-Astbury, E. L., Richardson, L., & Rouse, C. A. (2018). Recognizing Modern Slavery. *Journal of Human Trafficking*, *5*(3), 201-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322705.2018.1471863
- Maioli, S. C., Bhabha, J., Wickramage, K., Wood, L., C., Errange, L., Garcia, O. O., Burgess, R., Digidiki, V., Aldridge, R., & Devakumar, D. (2021). International migration of unaccompanied minors: Trends, health risks, and legal protection. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, *5*(12), 882-895.
- McLeigh, J. D., & Taylor, D. (2020). The role of religious institutions in preventing, eradicating, and mitigating violence against children. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *110*(1), 104313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104313
- Melton, G. B., & Anderson, D. (2008). From safe sanctuaries to strong communities: The role of communities of faith in child protection. *Family and Community Health*, *31*(2), 173-185.
- Mostajabian, S., Santa Maria, D., Wiemann, C., Newlin, E., & Bocchini, C. (2019). Identifying Sexual and Labor Exploitation among Sheltered Youth Experiencing Homelessness: A Comparison of Screening Methods. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, *16*(3), 363-379. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16030363
- Puigvert, L., Duque, E., Merodio, G., & Melgar, P. (2021). A systematic review of family and social relationships: implications for sex trafficking recruitment and victimisation. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1332/204674321x16358719475186

Bibliography – extended review

- Reed, S. M., Kennedy, M. A., Decker, M. R., & Cimino, A. N. (2019). Friends, family, and boyfriends: An analysis of relationship pathways into commercial sexual exploitation. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *90*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.01.016
- Robertson, S. (2011). Cash cows, backdoor migrants, or activist citizens? International students, citizenship, and rights in Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(12), 2192-2211. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.558590
- Robinson, M., & Hanmer, S. (2014). Engaging religious communities to protect children from abuse, neglect, and exploitation: partnerships require analysis of religious virtues and harms. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(4), 600-611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.03.018
- Turner-Moss, E., Zimmerman, C., Howard, L. M., & Oram, S. (2014). Labour Exploitation and Health: A Case Series of Men and Women Seeking Post-Trafficking Services. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, *16*(3), 473-480. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-013-9832-6
- van de Glind, H. (2010). *Migration and Child Labour: Exploring child migrant vulnerabilities and those of children left behind*.
- Zimmerman, C., McAlpine, A., & Kiss, L. (2015). *Safer labour migration and community-based prevention of exploitation: The state of the evidence for programming*.

Appendix: Methodology

Literature search

A literature search was conducted to identify published materials relevant to the following areas:

1. Safeguarding and protection of children from exploitation
2. Assessment and identification of exploitation of children
3. Social work approaches to addressing child exploitation for the child
4. Real-world examples of addressing child exploitation

Databases searched

- The following databases were included in the search for published literature:
  - CINAHL
  - PsycINFO
  - PubMed
  - ScienceDirect
  - Scopus
  - Google Scholar
  - Media sources
  - NGO/advocacy websites

Search returns and screening

- The initial search returned **1,134** documents for possible inclusion.
- After an initial screen based on titles and abstracts, **240** documents remained for possible inclusion.
- In order to reduce the number of final documents included in the literature scan, the following exclusion criteria were applied (although exceptions were made where documents were particularly relevant to the research areas):
  - Documents published prior to 2010
  - Documents focused on other contexts e.g., primary health care settings, justice settings
  - Documents focused on specifics of therapeutic/mental health interventions
  - Documents focused on the health and wellbeing impacts, or prevalence, of exploitation
  - Documents related to the history of child exploitation and related legislation
- This resulted in a final **62** documents informing the current literature scan.

Extended review

- After presenting the findings of the initial review to relevant Oranga Tamariki staff, the scope of the review was extended to include a more **targeted search** on the following topics, including materials without a specific social work lens:
  - What child labour exploitation looks like in practice (to inform screening)
  - The nature of child labour exploitation among migrants, international students, and refugees
  - Whether child labour exploitation has different characteristics to adult labour exploitation
  - The role of the church or religious organisations in prevention/intervention of child exploitation
  - Risk of child exploitation by adoption/familial relationships involved
- The search for literature relevant to these additional areas was conducted using a **non-systematic** search of relevant terms in Google Scholar.
- As a result of this non-systematic search, an additional **35** documents were identified and reviewed. Themes extracted from these additional documents were synthesised and are presented in the *Extended review* section of the current literature scan.