Purpose

The National Survivor Study (NSS) is envisioned as both a model of survivor empowerment and a tool for evidenced-based strategies and approaches to anti-trafficking work. The NSS aims to inform the anti-trafficking movement more broadly by filling key evidence gaps that exist in the field in full partnership with survivors. The purpose of this report is to demonstrate how Polaris engaged survivors and the anti-human trafficking movement in determining the values, research questions, and methodological design of the NSS. We are grateful for the thoughtful participation of anti-trafficking partners in an activity (Delphi survey) that we deployed to engage diverse voices in this process.

Methodology

A Delphi study, or “Delphi technique,” is a widely used process for developing an expert-based perspective on an issue through a structured multi-round process. By collecting information through an iterative method that includes feedback on the results of the previous round, this method can be useful for systematically collecting information from a panel of people with relevant experience. We deployed a two-round Delphi study between March and April 2021 to engage a diverse group of anti-trafficking professionals and survivors in a conversation about the most critical and relevant areas that should be investigated in the NSS. The first survey sought to understand whether proposed research topics were relevant to respondents’ work or focus, and the second survey explored whether respondents felt that research topics were important to the anti-trafficking field. Twenty research topics within five broad research areas were assessed by the participants. The five high-level research areas are listed below and a complete list of all research topics is included in Appendix A:

1. Perspectives: Survivor Opinions and Priorities
2. Prevention and Vulnerabilities to Trafficking
3. Relationships: Power and Equity
4. Policies, Practices and Resources
5. Resilience, Exit and Long-term Stability
More than 130 individual anti-trafficking professionals participated (66 in the first survey and 134 in the second survey - many of those who participated in the first survey also participated in the second). Overall, most participants in the Delphi studies were survivors, most respondents focused on sex trafficking or both sex and labor trafficking, most of their work centered around advocacy or policy, and around 30% were people of color. This report describes how the results of this process have been incorporated into the NSS.

A full breakdown of the demographics represented in each round of the Delphi is included in Appendix B.

Findings

The first survey asked participants to reflect on their personal experience and work and the second survey asked for their perspectives on the anti-human trafficking field more generally. Overwhelmingly, most, if not all, of the research topic areas were found to be important and relevant to anti-trafficking professionals’ work and to the field as a whole.

The topics that were most applicable to respondents’ work in the first survey were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How societal issues intersect with trafficking vulnerabilities and experiences</td>
<td>This can include issues like COVID, homelessness, or racism. This topic would involve examining how these issues or others like them impact the vulnerabilities and experiences of trafficking survivors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection between individual characteristics and risk of trafficking</td>
<td>Individual characteristics could include race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, and immigration status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The external conditions, access points, and resources most needed and used by survivors exiting trafficking and achieving long-term stability</td>
<td>For example, how does a criminal record impact long-term stability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How survivors experience the language and framing that describe trafficking and survivors</td>
<td>This can include the language survivors prefer as opposed to the language currently used by the anti-trafficking field and others and what framing would be the most empowering for survivors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full breakdown on the results of the first round of the Delphi survey can be found in Appendix C.
For the second Delphi survey, participants were provided with the results of the first survey and asked to rank the importance of the research topics and research areas to the anti-human trafficking field at this time.

The topic that was considered critically important for the field by the most participants was the intersection between a community’s access to viable employment, education, social networks, and financial services and the risk of trafficking.

This topic area could include studying how community support through family, friends, and others plays a role in the ability of individuals to access certain systems. For example, the lack of banking access in certain communities may make it harder for certain groups to have bank accounts, get loans, and build credit to be able to get higher paying jobs, buy houses, or start businesses.

The next three topics that were ranked as critically important for the anti-trafficking field at this time were: the external conditions, access points, and resources most needed and/or used by survivors to exit trafficking and achieve long-term stability; the internal strengths, skills, and coping strategies survivors develop and employ before, during, and after trafficking situations to support survival and long-term resilience; and the anti-trafficking conversations in which survivors feel included or excluded and how they would like to be engaged in these discussions.

A full breakdown of the second round of the Delphi survey can be found in Appendix D.

We also did an analysis to see if any differences in responses existed for specific groups of respondents (survivors, BIPOC respondents, and different fields like researchers, advocacy or policy professionals, and direct service providers) on the five broad research areas.

In the first Delphi survey, survivor opinions and priorities was the highest ranked research area for survivors, people of color, direct service providers, and advocacy and policy professionals.

In past research, while survivors may be subjects of research, they have had less control over the direction of research, the dissemination of research, and how it can be used for policy and advocacy. It was of great importance to the respondents as well as the Polaris research team to make sure that the opinions and priorities of survivors are a central focus of the NSS. Researchers ranked prevention and vulnerabilities to trafficking highest, with policies, practices, and resources ranked as the second highest category most relevant to their work.

In the second Delphi survey, some research topics were ranked as critically important by survivors more frequently than other groups. These include:

How policies and practices influence trafficking vulnerabilities
For example, how does arresting trafficking victims increase their vulnerability to continued trafficking as well as other victimization and impact their ability to rebuild their lives?

Survivors’ ability to exit trafficking and reintegrate, and external conditions and resources needed and used by survivors to exit and achieve stability
This could include specific needs survivors might have like employment, education, financial stability, child care, etc. that could potentially be barriers or access points for survivors in achieving stability.
These results suggest that survivor respondents would like to see research on policies, practices, and conditions that facilitate exit and stability.

Additionally, the differences in vulnerabilities, trafficking experiences, exits, and stability of different communities and groups was more frequently ranked as critically important by BIPOC respondents than by other groups.

For example, what are the specific service needs for transgender survivors or LGBTQ+ survivors and how do their experiences exiting trafficking differ from other survivors.

A full breakdown on these results can be found in Appendix E.

In each round of the Delphi, we also asked respondents to rank the importance of each research area. For the first round of the Delphi survey, survivors and anti-human trafficking professionals prioritized amplifying survivor voices and perspectives and ranked it first in terms of importance. For the second round of the Delphi survey, listening to survivor voices and perspectives were still found to be the most important.

A breakdown of the areas ranked #1 as the most important by specific demographic groups can be found in Appendix F.

Next Steps/Incorporation into NSS

All participants, regardless of their personal or work characteristics, ranked understanding survivor opinions and priorities as the most important research area for anti-trafficking work at this time.

The National Survivor Study (NSS) is designed to put the lived experiences of survivors at the forefront of the anti-trafficking movement.

Additionally, in the second round of the Delphi study the topic that was considered critically important by the most participants was the intersection between a community’s access to viable employment, education, social networks, and financial services and the risk of trafficking.

Therefore, the NSS will examine survivors’ experiences and perceptions of institutions that impact their livelihoods – including their influence on the assets and strategies required to secure the necessities of life.

A focus on the livelihoods of survivors readily aligns with the research priorities of the anti-trafficking professionals who gave input into the discussion on research topics for the NSS. This line of inquiry is intentionally focused on learning more from survivors about their current needs, access points to resources, as well as uplifting the internal strengths and coping strategies they develop; this is aligned with the research topics survivors selected as most critical for the first NSS:

Exploring the ways in which they would like to be engaged in anti-trafficking conversations they have felt excluded from;
Reviewing the external conditions, access points, and resources they most needed and/or used to exit trafficking and achieve long-term stability;

Understanding the internal strengths, skills, and coping strategies they develop and employ before, during, and after their trafficking situations to support survival and long-term resilience;

Examining the intersection between their access to community resources such as viable employment, education, social networks (friends, family, community), and financial services and their risk of trafficking.

Limitations

There are several limitations to our Delphi study. One was that despite our best efforts to publicize this survey, we were most likely reaching mostly anti-trafficking professionals and survivors familiar with Polaris and we might not have had the same insight and opinions from those outside of the individuals and groups Polaris tends to already work with. We have tried through additional methods, like interviews, in subsequent phases of this study to reach out to some of the groups missing from these results.

We also found that labor trafficking survivors and anti-trafficking professionals who work with labor trafficking survivors were underrepresented in these surveys. Therefore, we have prioritized reaching out to them and other groups like transgender survivors, male survivors, LGBTQ+ survivors, and others to make sure their voices are amplified in our work in addition to the responses and insights we received from the Delphi respondents.
Appendix A

List of Research Topics for Delphi Study

Research Area 1: Perspectives: Survivor Opinions and Priorities
1. How survivors prioritize major issues that the anti-trafficking field is working on (e.g. visa reform, economic/professional development, decriminalization/criminal relief)
2. How survivors experience the language and framing used to describe trafficking and trafficking survivors
3. The anti-trafficking conversations in which survivors feel included or excluded and how they would like to be engaged in these discussions
4. How current efforts and priorities in the anti-trafficking field challenge or support a survivor’s ability to find justice

Research Area 2: Prevention and Vulnerabilities to Trafficking
1. The intersection between a person’s individual characteristics (i.e., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, immigration status, economic status, education level) and their risk of trafficking
2. The intersection between a community's access to viable employment, education, social networks (friends, family, community), and financial services and their risk of trafficking
3. Current trends in trafficking recruitment methods including financial patterns, emerging coercion and fraud tactics (e.g. use of social media, offers of employment, etc.)

Research Area 3: Relationships: Power and Equity
1. Patterns in relationships between the trafficker and victim including family relationship (parent/child, etc.), socio-economic status, gender/racial dynamics, nationality, etc.
2. Differences in the vulnerabilities, trafficking experiences, exits, and long-term stability of different communities or groups (based on race/ethnicity, gender, socio-economic condition/class, sexual orientation, immigration status, etc.)
3. What societal attitudes/beliefs, assumptions, and social norms positively or negatively influence survivors’ ability to exit their situations and to fully reintegrate into their communities afterwards
4. If and how a survivor’s social status or personal identity (e.g. race/gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation) influence how they are perceived and treated within various institutions (e.g. service organizations, financial services, justices system, etc.)
**Research Area 4: Policies, Practices and Resources**

1. How the policies and practices of specific systems or services (e.g. healthcare, financial services, foster care, etc.) positively or negatively influence trafficking vulnerabilities as well as survivors’ ability to exit their trafficking situations and fully re-integrate into their communities

2. How societal issues (poverty and homelessness, domestic violence, the COVID) intersect with trafficking vulnerabilities and experiences

3. Current experiences of survivors of labor trafficking situations including working conditions, access to information, workers’ understanding of their rights and avenues for exit, etc.

4. How social media platforms and services are used to facilitate or disrupt trafficking as well as how survivors access and use social media services during their trafficking situation, exit, recovery, and readjustment

5. How financial institutions or services are used to facilitate trafficking as well as how survivors access and use financial services during their trafficking, exit, recovery, and readjustment

**Research Area 5: Resilience, Exit and Long-term Stability**

1. The short- and long-term consequences on survivors and/or victims of leaving different types of sex and labor trafficking situations

2. The internal strengths, skills, and coping strategies survivors develop and employ before, during, and after trafficking situations to support survival and long-term resilience

3. The external conditions, access points, and resources most needed and/or used by survivors to exit trafficking and achieve long-term stability
# APPENDIX B

Demographic characteristics of both rounds of Delphi Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>First survey</th>
<th>Second survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td>(N=66)</td>
<td>(N=134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East or Southeast Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern, North African, or Arab</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial or multiracial</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listed, please incorporate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (combined variable)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td>(N=66)</td>
<td>(N=133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender woman</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender man</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non binary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listed, please incorporate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF ANTI-TRAFFICKING WORK</strong></td>
<td>(N=66)</td>
<td>(N=134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professional</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>First survey</td>
<td>Second survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF TRAFFICKING WORK FOCUSES ON</strong></td>
<td>(N=66)</td>
<td>(N=133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both and other type of trafficking</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURVIVOR STATUS</strong></td>
<td>(N=66)</td>
<td>(N=134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a survivor</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF TRAFFICKING EXPERIENCED</strong></td>
<td>(N=35)</td>
<td>(N=72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### First Round Delphi Study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Applicable/relevant to my current work or focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How societal issues intersect with trafficking vulnerabilities and experiences (N=66)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection between a person’s individual characteristics and their risk of trafficking (N=66)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How survivors experience the language and framing used to describe trafficking and survivors (N=66)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The external conditions, access points, and resources most needed and/or used by survivors to exit trafficking and achieve long-term stability (N=66)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The anti-trafficking conversations in which survivors feel included or excluded and how they would like to engage (N=66)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection between a community’s access to viable employment, education, social networks, and financial services and the risk of trafficking (N=66)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current trends in trafficking recruitment methods including financial patterns, emerging coercion and fraud tactics (N=66)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in the vulnerabilities, trafficking experiences, exits and long-term stability of different communities or groups (N=66)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How policies and practices positively or negatively influence trafficking vulnerabilities and survivors’ ability to exit trafficking and fully reintegrate into their communities (N=66)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What societal attitudes/beliefs, assumptions, and social norms positively or negatively influence survivors’ ability to exit their situations and fully reintegrate into their communities afterwards (N=66)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If and how a survivor’s social status or personal identity influence how they are perceived and treated within various institutions (N=66)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How survivors prioritize major issues (N=66)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How current efforts and priorities in the anti-trafficking field challenge or support a survivor’s ability to find justice (N=66)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How social media platforms and services are used to facilitate or disrupt trafficking as well as how survivors access and use social media services (N=50)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experiences of survivors within the criminal justice system and how this impacts exit and long-term stability for survivors (N=66)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal strengths, skills, and coping strategies survivors develop and employ before, during, and after trafficking (N=66)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The short- and long-term consequences on survivors or victims of leaving different types of trafficking situations (N=66)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns in relationships between the trafficker and victim including family relationship, socio-economic status, gender/racial dynamics, nationality, etc. (N=66)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How financial institutions or services are used to facilitate trafficking and how survivors access and use financial services (N=50)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current experiences of survivors in labor trafficking situations (N=66)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX D

## Second Round Delphi Study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Critically Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intersection between a community’s access to viable employment, education, social networks (friends, family, community), and financial services and the risk of trafficking (N=132)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The external conditions, access points, and resources most needed and/or used by survivors to exit trafficking and achieve long-term stability (N=125)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal strengths, skills, and coping strategies survivors develop and employ before, during, and after trafficking situations to support survival and long term resilience (N=125)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The anti-trafficking conversations in which survivors feel included or excluded and how they would like to be engaged in these discussions (N=134)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the policies and practices of specific systems or services (e.g. healthcare, financial services, foster care etc.) positively or negatively influence trafficking vulnerabilities as well as survivors’ ability to exit their trafficking situations and fully reintegrate into their communities (N=126)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How survivors prioritize major issues that the anti-trafficking field is working on (e.g. visa reform, economic/professional development, criminal relief) (N=134)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experiences of survivors within the criminal justice system and how this impacts exit and long-term stability for survivors (N=125)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How survivors experience the language and framing used to describe trafficking and trafficking survivors (N=134)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How current efforts and priorities in the anti-trafficking field challenge or support a survivor’s ability to find justice (N=134)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What societal attitudes/beliefs, assumptions, and social norms positively or negatively influence survivors’ ability to exit their situations and fully reintegrate into their communities afterwards (N=129)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current experiences of survivors in labor trafficking situations including working conditions, access to information, workers’ understanding of their rights and avenues for exit, etc. (N=126)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How societal issues (poverty and homelessness, domestic violence, the Covid-19 pandemic) intersect with trafficking vulnerabilities and experiences. (N=126)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRITICALLY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
<td>I DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The short- and long-term consequences on survivors of leaving different types of sex and labor trafficking situations (N=125)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If and how a survivor’s social status or personal identity (e.g. race/gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation) influence how they are perceived and treated within various institutions (e.g. service organizations, financial services, justices system, etc.) (N=129)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in the vulnerabilities, trafficking experiences, exits, and long-term stability of different communities or groups (based on race/ethnicity, gender, socio-economic condition/class, sexual orientation, immigration status, etc.) (N=129)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current trends in trafficking recruitment methods including financial patterns, emerging coercion and fraud tactics (e.g. use of social media, offers of employment, etc.) (N=132)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How social media platforms and services are used to facilitate or disrupt trafficking as well as how survivors access and use social media services during their trafficking situation as well as exit, recovery, and readjustment. (N=126)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection between a person’s individual characteristics (i.e., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, immigration status, economic status, education level) and their risk of trafficking. (N=132)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns in relationships between the trafficker and victim including family relationship (parent/child, etc), socio-economic status, gender/racial dynamics, nationality, etc. (N=129)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How financial institutions or services are used to facilitate trafficking as well as how survivors access and use financial services during their trafficking as well as for exit, recovery, and readjustment (N=126)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

### 1st and 2nd Round Delphi Study Results by Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>How Survivors Prioritize Major Issues</th>
<th>How Survivors Experience the Language and Framing Used to Describe Trafficking and Survivors</th>
<th>The Anti-Trafficking Conversations in Which Survivors Feel Included or Excluded and How They Would Like to Engage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</td>
<td>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=134)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=54)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=80)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=134)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=54)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=80)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=134)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=54)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=80)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How Current Efforts and Priorities in the Anti-Trafficking Field Challenge or Support a Survivor’s Ability to Find Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=134)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=54)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=80)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Intersection Between a Person’s Individual Characteristics and Their Risk of Trafficking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey:</th>
<th>Second survey:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=132)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=52)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=78)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Intersection Between a Community’s Access to Viable Employment, Education, Social Networks, and Financial Services and the Risk of Trafficking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey:</th>
<th>Second survey:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=132)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=52)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=78)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Trends in Trafficking Recruitment Methods Including Financial Patterns, Emerging Coercion and Fraud Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>First Survey: Applicable/Relevant to Respondent's Work (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey: Most Critical to the Anti-Trafficking Field (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=132)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=72)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=38)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=52)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=78)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=34)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Patterns in Relationships Between the Trafficker and Victim Including Family Relationship, Socio-Economic Status, Gender/Racial Dynamics, Nationality, Etc. (N=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>First Survey: (N=66); (N=129) (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey: (N=66); (N=129) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=129)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=51)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=77)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=33)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Differences in the Vulnerabilities, Trafficking Experiences, Exits, and Long-Term Stability of Different Communities or Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>First Survey: (N=66); (N=129) (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey: (N=66); (N=129) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=129)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=51)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=77)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=33)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WHAT SOCIETAL ATTITUDES/BELIEFS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND SOCIAL NORMS, POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY INFLUENCE SURVIVORS’ ABILITY TO EXIT THEIR SITUATIONS AND TO FULLY REINTEGRATE INTO THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTERWARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=129)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=51)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=77)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=33)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF AND HOW A SURVIVOR’S SOCIAL STATUS OR PERSONAL IDENTITY INFLUENCE HOW THEY ARE PERCEIVED AND TREATED WITHIN VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=129)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=51)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=77)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=33)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW POLICIES AND PRACTICES POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY INFLUENCE TRAFFICKING VULNERABILITIES AND SURVIVORS’ ABILITY TO EXIT TRAFFICKING AND FULLY REINTEGRATE INTO THEIR COMMUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=126)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=77)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW SOCIETAL ISSUES INTERSECT WITH TRAFFICKING VULNERABILITIES AND EXPERIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent's work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=126)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRENT EXPERIENCES OF SURVIVORS IN LABOR TRAFFICKING SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=126)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=70)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS AND SERVICES ARE USED TO FACILITATE OR DISRUPT TRAFFICKING AS WELL AS HOW SURVIVORS ACCESS AND USE SOCIAL MEDIA SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=50); (N=126)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=25); (N=70)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=14); (N=37)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=19); (N=50)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=28); (N=76)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=20); (N=32)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOW FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OR SERVICES ARE USED TO FACILITATE TRAFFICKING AND HOW SURVIVORS ACCESS AND USE FINANCIAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Survey (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=50); (N=126)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=25); (N=70)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=14); (N=37)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=19); (N=50)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=28); (N=76)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=20); (N=32)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE SHORT- AND LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES ON SURVIVORS AND/OR VICTIMS OF LEAVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRAFFICKING SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Survey (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=125)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=69)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE INTERNAL STRENGTHS, SKILLS, AND COPING STRATEGIES SURVIVORS DEVELOP AND EMPLOY BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER TRAFFICKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Survey (%)</th>
<th>Second Survey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=125)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=69)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The External Conditions, Access Points, and Resources Most Needed and/or Used by Survivors to Exit Trafficking and Achieve Long-Term Stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=125)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=69)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Experiences of Survivors Within the Criminal Justice System and How This Impacts Exit and Long-Term Stability for Survivors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First survey: applicable/relevant to respondent’s work</th>
<th>Second survey: most critical to the anti-trafficking field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66); (N=125)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35); (N=69)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21); (N=37)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26); (N=50)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35); (N=76)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22); (N=32)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX F

### Areas Ranked with Priority of #1 for 1st and 2nd Delphi Survey by Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=66)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=35)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=21)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=26)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=35)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=22)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=121)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors (N=68)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC (N=36)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service provider (N=49)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy professionals (N=74)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=30)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the first survey, participants were allowed to select multiple areas for their number 1 choice, thus the reason the percentages do not add to 100%.