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Abstract

Human trafficking has garnered the attention of policymakers, the media, and academics for years. However, controversy, competing discourses, and a lack of conceptual clarity often complicate efforts to prevent and address the problem of human trafficking in local contexts throughout the U.S. Interviews with 13 local service providers on the islands of O‘ahu, Maui, and Hawai‘i were conducted to explore discourses on human trafficking in the Islands. Critical discourse analytical methodologies were used to: 1) map discourse strands, 2) understand how human trafficking is situated in a context of other phenomena, and 3) explore how key social actors were characterized. Results indicated that participant discourses were both idiosyncratically constructed according to individual preference, experience, and values, and were influenced by prevailing cultural and societal discourses. The implications of these discourses, in terms of their ability to hinder or aid socially just understandings of the issue, are discussed.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables .......................................................................................................................... 7
List of Figures ............................................................................................................................ 8
Chapter 1. Introduction .............................................................................................................. 9
Chapter 2. Literature Review ................................................................................................... 12
  Defining Human Trafficking: A Political Act ......................................................................... 13
  Federal Human Trafficking Policy ......................................................................................... 18
  Media Context ....................................................................................................................... 27
  Academia and Human Trafficking ......................................................................................... 32
    Social science scholarship .................................................................................................... 33
    Legal and feminist scholarship ........................................................................................... 44
  Trafficking in Hawai‘i ............................................................................................................... 51
  Discourse Analysis ................................................................................................................. 55
  Present Study ......................................................................................................................... 59
Chapter 3. Methods .................................................................................................................. 63
  Study Design ......................................................................................................................... 63
  Participants ............................................................................................................................. 63
  Measures ................................................................................................................................ 64
  Procedures ............................................................................................................................... 66
    Critical discourse procedures .............................................................................................. 68
  Analytical Methods ................................................................................................................. 70
    Three stages of CDA analysis .............................................................................................. 73
  Supplemental Information ....................................................................................................... 76
  Validity of Findings ................................................................................................................ 79
Chapter 4. Results I (CDA Analysis) ........................................................................................ 82
  Stage 1: Discourse Strands and Knots .................................................................................... 82
    Six major discourse strands ............................................................................................... 83
    Two major discursive knots ............................................................................................... 89
    Domestic violence and human trafficking ......................................................................... 97
    Discourses on consent interact with both discursive knots ................................................ 98
    Idiosyncratic discourse maps ............................................................................................. 102
  Stage 2: Nomination and Predication Strategies for Trafficking-Related Phenomena ........ 107
List of Tables

Table 1. Important Provisions of the TVPA 2000 ................................................................. 24
Table 2. Chronological Presentation of Major Social Science Studies on Human Trafficking .... 34
Table 3. Example of Discourse Strand Analysis ...................................................................... 82
Table 4. Example of the nomination and predication analysis of trafficking and related phenomena .......................................................................................................................... 107
Table 5. Frequency of nomination strategies for the phenomenon of human trafficking .......... 111
Table 6. Frequency of select target words within the Labor/Immigration knot ....................... 115
Table 7. Nomination strategies for phenomena located under the Labor/Immigration knot .... 121
Table 8: Frequency of select target words within the Sex/Children/Gender knot ................. 128
Table 9. Nomination strategies for phenomena located under the Sex/Children/Gender knot ........................................................................................................................................ 130
Table 10. Frequency of specific nominations strategies for potential victims ...................... 141
Table 11. Frequency of non-specific nomination strategies for potential victims .................. 143
Table 12. List of nomination strategies for victims and potential victims ............................... 145
Table 13. Frequency of select nomination strategies for potential perpetrators of human trafficking ........................................................................................................................................ 149
Table 14. List of nomination strategies for perpetrators ............................................................ 149
Table 15. Availability of sources during each timeframe of the newspaper search ............... 166
List of Figures

Figure 1. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0048).................................90
Figure 2. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0044).................................90
Figure 3. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0046)..............................94
Figure 4. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0054)..............................94
Figure 5. Discourse strand map for participant 0046 .............................................................103
Figure 6. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0046).................................104
Figure 7. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0046)..............................104
Figure 8. Discourse strand map for participant 0054 .............................................................105
Figure 9. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0054).................................105
Figure 10. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0054)............................105
Figure 11. Discourse strand map for participant 0048 .............................................................106
Figure 12. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0048).................................106
Figure 13. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0048)............................106
Figure 14. Number of articles discussing mainly labor, mainly sex, or both from 2002-2013...168
Figure 15. Number of articles mentioning specific cases or legislation from 2002-2013...........170
Figure 16. Number of articles mentioning select human trafficking cases from 2002-2013.....171
Figure 17. Number of articles that use select discursive strategies from 2002-2013...............180
Chapter 1. Introduction

Human trafficking has captured the attention of our nation for more than a decade. The media has served to inform the public, which has led to general national awareness of trafficking as a horrific human rights abuse. The U.S. government has taken a strong stance against trafficking in both the national and international arenas, as is exemplified in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA) and the major role the U.S. played in crafting the U.N. protocol on trafficking. Academics have weighed in with research ranging from assessments of services for human trafficking survivors to a philosophical dissection of our national approach to human trafficking.

From the early years of discussion and policy implementation the issue of trafficking has been plagued by controversy. This controversy has played out in national and international policy and politics, in the media, and in academia. At the heart of the controversy is the definition of human trafficking. Implicit to each definition offered and argued about is the theoretical framework that lay behind it. For example, many view human trafficking through a labor rights framework (Bales & Soodalter, 2009; Brennan, 2010) and/or an immigration framework (Bales & Soodalter, 2009), or more generally, a human rights framework (Caraway, 2005). Others also view human trafficking as a gender issue (Raymond, Hughes, & Gomez, 2001). That there are various and multiple lenses through which people view human trafficking has direct implications for attempts to address the problem. Those who see human trafficking as a migration issue might attempt to address the problem through immigration reform, while those who see it as a gender issue might approach it by attempting to bolster women’s rights in source countries, and so on.
It is not clear, however, how this national and international controversy over the definition and framework of human trafficking impacts local efforts to address the problem. How do local stakeholders talk about human trafficking? Are they actively involved in this definitional debate? Are they influenced by the debate, but unaware of the degree to which they are influenced? Human trafficking as understood in local context is likely influenced by particular local historical and sociocultural factors. In particular, the state of Hawai‘i has unique geographic, historic, and cultural contexts that may influence how human trafficking appears and is conceptualized in the islands. Understanding local conceptualizations of human trafficking is critical to understanding how human trafficking policy is implemented on the local level.

One tool that could be helpful in elucidating these questions is critical discourse analysis. Parker (1992) defines discourse as “sets of meanings which constitute objects.” As the term “human trafficking” is relatively new and the battle over how to define it is intense, a systematic analysis of the webs of meaning used to constitute it could reveal the various historically bound discourses that underlie local attempts to talk about human trafficking. As Parker (1992) says:

Discourses provide frameworks for debating the values of one way of talking about reality over other ways…When we look at discourses in their historical context, it becomes clear that they are quite coherent, and that as they are elaborated by academics and in everyday life they become more carefully systematized. Discourse analysis deliberately systematizes different ways of talking so we can understand them better. A study of discourse dynamics takes off from this to look at the tensions within discourses and the way they reproduce and transform the world (p. 5, emphasis in original).

All too often when government officials, the media, and even academics discuss human trafficking it is not clear how they are defining the term. Many people,
including this researcher, initially, equate human trafficking with “sex slavery.” As I hope will become apparent, this is likely partially the result of battling discourses in the world of human trafficking that users employ either with or without being aware of the history and discursive context of the term. I hope that systematically analyzing the way human trafficking is discussed by local service providers will make these underlying tensions apparent and facilitate research and discussion that is more transparent and less rhetoric-bound.

To achieve this end, I conducted qualitative interviews with 13 local service providers from three islands in Hawai‘i. Participants were asked about their thoughts and experiences surrounding the problem of human trafficking. A number of local, state, and federal agencies, as well as law enforcement and non-profit groups, work together to address human trafficking. Therefore, service providers included state or county employees, social services representatives, and legal aid attorneys, among others. These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. I then used critical discourse analytic methods to systematically examine the ways in which the interviewees construct “human trafficking” through how they talk about the problem. While some authors have attempted to look at human trafficking discourses on a national and international level, little attention has been paid to how the arguments that occur in national policy debates and academic writing are combined and reproduced on the local level. Understanding the discourses at play within a specific socio-historical context is an important first step in investigating human trafficking policy and practice at the local level. Therefore, in order to better understand issues related to addressing human trafficking in Hawai‘i, this study explores the specific discourses that construct local understandings of the phenomenon.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

“Human trafficking” is not a concrete, physical thing. It is a concept created through discourse. Though it does seek to define, describe, and categorize concrete phenomena, how these phenomena are defined, described, and categorized is a political act, rather than a purely rational or scientific one. Critical discourse analysis is one tool that can be used to look at the ways in which people use language to shape social problems. For this, researchers examine texts. In this methodology texts are defined broadly as symbolic representations of meaning (Fairclough, 2003; Parker, 1992). Texts can include written language, spoken language, or even pictorial representations. In these terms, the interviews gathered in this study are considered texts which can both create meanings and perpetuate meanings by reflecting other “texts.”

We can begin by noting that for any particular text or type of text, there is a set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant, and potentially incorporated into the text. It may not be possible to identify these texts with great precision, and they may be rather extensive and complex. But it is analytically useful to begin with some rough idea of them, for a significant initial question is: which texts and voices are included, which are excluded, and what significant absences are there? (Fairclough, 2003, p. 47)

Following Fairclough’s advice, this literature review section intends to “begin with some rough idea” of the complex and interrelated kinds of texts from which the research participants may be drawing, consciously or unconsciously, in their discussion of human trafficking. To do this, I will first lay out some of the definitional complications that have plagued the discussion about human trafficking. I will then discuss the relevant information pertaining to the way human trafficking has been discussed in three important national arenas: public policy, the media, and academia. In discussing these “texts” it is helpful to include excerpts of select kinds of discourses so
as to provide direct reference to the discourse. Finally, before discussing critical discourse analytic methodology, I will highlight some aspects of the local context in Hawai‘i that may contribute to discourses on human trafficking in the Islands.

**Defining Human Trafficking: A Political Act**

Human trafficking is a relatively new term, but the practice of forced labor is certainly not a new one. At the end of the 20th century forced labor practices began to generate international concern particularly regarding the ways in which they reflected the growing globalization of the world economy. Migrants from developing countries sought access to job opportunities in more prosperous countries and immigration policies tightened. This created new routes of irregular migration and a population of vulnerable migrants, some of whom began to fall prey to unscrupulous employers who coerced them into forced labor situations (Caraway, 2005). Additionally, the demand for cheaper products in developed countries, coupled with the move of corporate manufacturing overseas led to the flourishing of forced labor practices in the developing world being used to manufacture products for these multinational companies (Androff, 2011; Bales, 2004).

A considerable amount of controversy surrounds what to label this globalized form of forced labor, the very definition of human trafficking, and the terminology used when discussing it. One facet of human trafficking that has been the focus of particular interest nationally and internationally is referred to specifically as “sex trafficking.” Like the phenomenon of forced labor, forced or coerced work in the sex industry is not a new phenomenon, but the categorization of it in terms of human trafficking has been the focus of fierce debate in recent years. Here in the United States, there are some trafficking activists that advocate for the inclusion of all forms of prostitution in the
definition of human trafficking, arguing that by its very nature prostitution is debasing and harmful to women and that it is fundamentally coercive (Raymond et al., 2001).

These advocates are often referred to as abolitionists or the anti-prostitution camp. At the heart of their argument seems to be the desire not to exclude women who need the protection and services that trafficking laws can provide.

The other side of the debate, often called the anti-human trafficking camp (DeStefano, 2007), argues that not all prostitution is forced and that focusing on eliminating prostitution is likely distracting from those who are suffering under forced labor. At the heart of this argument is a desire to focus the core meaning of the term “human trafficking” on forced servitude. Some argue that if the definition of human trafficking is too inclusive the term becomes diluted beyond usefulness (Androff, 2011).

In addition to these debates on how to define the problem of “human trafficking,” there is also some disagreement over the terms used to describe it. Some authors argue that the term “human trafficking” is not adequate to describe the actual offenses it has been coined to encompass:

The terms "human trafficking" and "slavery" have become synonymous. Trafficking originated as a policy definition as an extension of drug trafficking and arms trafficking, primarily referring to cases of slavery wherein victims cross international political boundaries...Additionally, many prefer the term "slavery" to "trafficking" as the former serves to both connect the current problem to the historical context of forced labor and to highlight the brutal reality and human suffering. The term "trafficking" can reflect a sanitized version of this problem (Androff, 2011, p. 212).

Indeed, the use of the term “human trafficking” can be confusing. The word “trafficking” in common usage has a connotation of movement, especially movement across borders. It is typically used in this way when talking about gun trafficking or
drug trafficking (DeStefano, 2007). However, not all persons who are now considered survivors of human trafficking under current laws have been transported across international, or even state, borders. In the United States there is now a large portion of “domestically trafficked” persons. These are people who have been in both forced labor and forced prostitution situations in the U.S., but are citizens of the United States. Bales and Soodalter (2009) and DeStefano (2007) both describe a case in which African American homeless men were exploited in a forced labor situation. As will be discussed in more detail below, the major U.S. policy document defining human trafficking for legal purposes, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (the TVPA) also considers all prostitution of girls under the age of 18 to be sex trafficking, regardless of whether they have crossed a border. This has produced a large group of young “trafficking” survivors who may never have left their hometown. This growing phenomenon of locating domestic victims of human trafficking makes using the term “trafficking” confusing and problematic. For these reasons some authors use the word “slavery” when discussing this issue (Androff, 2011; Bales, 2004; Kara, 2010).

The use of the word slavery in the United States has clear ties to antebellum practices of slaveholding. To some extent, modern forced labor practices have resembled the practices of historical slavery and the word “slavery” certainly captures the horror of the abuses that have occurred in some forced labor situations in the United States. However, modern forced labor differs from historical slavery in a number of important ways. Some propose that past slaveholders had more of an incentive to protect their investments by maintaining the health of their slaves than do modern day perpetrators of forced labor (Androff, 2011; Bales, 2004). It is thought that the legal sanctioning of antebellum slavery, the great financial investment often required to
purchase each slave, and the relative difficulty in acquiring more slaves contributed to this motivation to keep slaves in health during that time (Bales, 2004). Today, the illicit nature of modern forced labor, coupled with “the greater availability and decreased cost of slaves, has resulted in a disincentive for the slaveholder to maintain the health and survival of the slave” (Androff, 2011, p. 211). Kevin Bales (2004) highlights this phenomenon hyperbolically by terming the victims of this new kind of slavery “disposable people”.

Additionally, modern slavery differs from historical slavery in the diversity of its victims. Institutionalized slavery often justified its existence with racist rhetoric, claiming the inferiority of the African race. Thus, victims of antebellum slavery in the U.S. were almost exclusively African. Modern forced labor is far more diverse because it is often opportunistic. Traffickers today are more likely to take advantage of the economic vulnerability of migrants than to use racial justifications to choose their victims. While there are still racial components to forced labor today, the ethnic vulnerabilities of trafficked persons is far more likely to stem from the global structure of economic disparity (Androff, 2011).

Given the historical meaning of slavery in this country and the vast and devastating multigenerational consequences that have stemmed from the era of legalized slavery, some argue its application in current circumstances should be limited.

Over the years many groups have tried to use the word *slavery* to accentuate or dramatize their issue. In the 1990's one group even urged the United Nations to name incest as a type of slavery. Low-wage workers and economic migrants are sometimes termed slaves, but the dilution of the word *slavery* serves no one. Slavery is based in violence. *Slavery*, throughout all of human history, has meant holding people against their will through the threat or reality of violence, forcing them to work, and paying
them nothing beyond subsistence. To attempt to expand the definition of slavery to include anyone who can walk away, who can make a choice about his or her situation, is to rob the word of its meaning and to demean those who have suffered in slavery over the centuries (Bales & Soodalter, 2009, p. 112).

There are certainly horrific instances of violence-based forced labor and prostitution in the United States today. For those cases the term “slavery” does seem to capture the reality of the offense far better than the term “human trafficking.” However, as Bales and Soodalter described above, the word slavery has historical contexts that make its use to describe all those who fall under the legal definition of human trafficking problematic and politically charged.

Since the legal framework for the issue of forced labor and forced sex work uses the term “human trafficking,” I will primarily use this term when discussing this phenomenon. Despite its limitations, it is the term most likely to be used by local stakeholders when working with trafficked persons. Additionally, this is the term around which most of the discourse on this issue centers. The fact that even those who advocate for the use of other terms usually have to make an argument for why they chose not to use the term “human trafficking,” makes this the dominant terminology of the debate.

Beyond the challenges involved in labeling the phenomenon of human trafficking, there are various other debates and controversies surrounding how to define the term. These debates have been largely carried out in three public arenas: politics and federal human trafficking policy, the media and its coverage of human trafficking, and academia and its assessment and critique of issues related to human trafficking. Each has played a major role in setting the national context of human trafficking.
discussions. These three arenas have likely influenced how local service providers define human trafficking and the “texts” they draw on to describe it. Below, I will discuss some important issues related to each of these arenas as they might pertain to how human trafficking is discussed in Hawai‘i. It is important to note, however, that while I have separated these human trafficking discussions for simplicity and clarity, in reality they are interrelated, influencing and drawing upon one another in a complicated network of discourses.

Federal Human Trafficking Policy

In 2000, Congress created a new law to address the phenomenon increasingly recognized as “human trafficking:” The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. The main feature of this legislation that addresses human trafficking is Division A: Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Clawson, Small, Go, & Myles, 2003). This legislation is commonly referred to as the TVPA and has been one of the major factors shaping human trafficking policies, practices, and discourses in the United States.

It is important to note that around the same time that U.S. lawmakers were beginning discussions on how to address human trafficking domestically, international negotiations were taking place around a U.N. protocol to address the same issue. Internationally, human trafficking had been linked to organized crime activity, so the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (often called the Palermo Protocol or the Trafficking Protocol) became a U.N. protocol attached to the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, which was adopted in 2000 (Emerton, Laidler, & Petersen, 2007). The U.S. was actively involved
in the international negotiations that resulted in the Trafficking Protocol, as were many U.S.-based non-governmental groups.

During both the U.S. Congress and U.N. negotiations there was a considerable amount of controversy over how to define and address human trafficking (Emerton et al., 2007). Since these two major human trafficking documents were developed in tandem and with similar controversy, they are both fairly important and influential in constructing human trafficking. However, the main focus for this literature review will be on U.S. anti-trafficking policy, with brief references to international policy where appropriate. Much has been written about the TVPA and its reauthorizations, but for the purposes of this proposal I intend only to give a general idea of the discursive context leading up to the legislation, a brief description of some of the major provisions of the TVPA, and a discussion of some of the controversy surrounding the various reauthorizations of the Act.

Prior to 2000, there were existing U.S. laws against various kinds of exploitation that are similar to human trafficking. For instance, in 1865 the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution made slavery and involuntary servitude illegal (Stolz, 2007); and the Mann Act made transporting women across state borders for the purpose of prostitution illegal in 1910 (Chacón, 2006). However, when large scale forced labor and prostitution cases began to make headlines in the 1990’s, prosecutors found that these various legal tools were inadequate and unwieldy.

In 2000 congressional testimony, the Department of Justice enumerated the following limitations: (1) criminalization of only a narrow range of trafficking acts (e.g., the sex trade); (2) failure to reach all who profit by forced labor of persons (e.g., farm laborer contractors); and (3) requirement that the defendant be shown to have used actual force, threat of force, or illegal coercion to enslave the victim, thereby limiting the ability of federal law
enforcement to reach more subtle forms of trafficking (Stolz, 2007, p. 317).

By the end of the twentieth century there was some consensus that a new law specifically addressing what was becoming known as “human trafficking” was necessary. A few members of Congress took up the cause and pursued anti-trafficking legislation. However, the drafting of the law was a topic of contentious debate (DeStefano, 2007). Disagreements arose between some members of Congress proposing different versions of the legislation and between advocacy groups over how to conceptualize and address human trafficking.

In the late 1990’s there were three separate bills drafted by various congressional committees which attempted to address human trafficking in the United States (Stolz, 2007). Two politicians who were influential in this drafting process were Representative Chris Smith (R) and Senator Paul Wellstone (D). In his book, The War on Human Trafficking: U.S. Policy Assessed, Anthony DeStefano (2007) writes about some of the differences between the approaches these two men took to conceptualizing human trafficking,

Though both Wellstone and Smith were eager to fight human trafficking, their key philosophical differences revolved around the issue of sex…Smith, in contrast, was very disturbed about the sexual exploitation of trafficking victims under the age of eighteen, and his concerns influenced much of what appeared in his legislative proposal. Wellstone didn’t appreciate the conservative Republican’s seeming preoccupation with sex and trafficking, said one of his former aids. He saw trafficking as slavery and thought that the ‘sex is sin’ angle pervading the debate was misplaced (p. 37).

It is clear from this assessment that political divisions over how to conceptualize human trafficking divided members of Congress from the early stages of crafting the new law.
In addition to this division among legislators there were also advocacy and interest groups actively lobbying for various versions of the bill. In reviewing the documents produced during the legislative process leading up to and following the passages of the TVPA in 2000, Stolz (2007) found that interest groups attempted to influence legislation in a number of ways, including testifying at hearings, meeting with lawmakers, and speaking with the press. These interest groups consisted of religious coalitions, feminist groups, and non-profit groups working with trafficked persons. Specifically, Stolz (2007) described how religious organizations, in cooperation with some feminist organizations, worked “behind the scenes” to influence the legislation. While an alliance between religious and feminist groups may seem unusual, Jacqueline Berman (2005) has written about how this peculiar “powerful political alliance” was forged based on underlying common ground that allowed these groups to cooperate in this sphere despite major differences in other ideological areas. She found that their “shared views of sexuality, prostitution, the role of morality in public life, and universalist constructions of women have combined to produce a conflation of trafficking in women and prostitution” (p. 272).

A major focus of their efforts was eliminating a particular phrase from the definition of sex trafficking: “force, fraud, and coercion.” Eliminating this phrase would allow for a broader conceptualization of human trafficking that could include any form of exploitation in the sex industry. As many of these groups believed that prostitution itself is exploitative by definition, this would effectively include prostitution under the rubric of human trafficking (Sullivan, 2003). One of the most vocal organizations lobbying for this change was the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW) (Berman, 2005). As discussed above, other groups, such as the Global Rights’ Initiative
Against Trafficking in Persons, opposed this broader definition of human trafficking (Bales & Soodalter, 2009).

The final version of the Law was a compromise between the two bills put forward by Representative Smith, with the support of CATW, and Senator Wellstone. It is significant to note that during this contentious debate, the voices of trafficked persons were not featured prominently. Brennan (2005) points out that unlike survivors of domestic violence, who were active in fighting for legislation to address domestic violence, formerly trafficked persons were generally not active participants in the political process leading up to the TVPA. Some gave Congressional testimony as victims (Stolz, 2007), but few were active agents in the process.

Despite this ongoing controversy, the TVPA was passed almost unanimously (only one representative dissented) and provides the major legal framework for human trafficking in the United States (Chacón, 2006). The final result of this legislation presents a two-tier definition of human trafficking. The first tier defines severe forms of trafficking in persons as:

(a) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, and coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or
(b) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery (Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, 2000).

In what some see as a concession to the anti-prostitution movement, the second tier of human trafficking specifically addresses sex trafficking without using the controversial phrase “force, fraud, or coercion”. Stolz (2007) presents this second tier as mostly symbolic. She writes that this is not “the operative definition of trafficking” as only
victims of the first tier, “severe forms of trafficking in persons,” are eligible for receiving help under the TVPA.

In addition to a distinction between sex trafficking and labor trafficking, the definition of human trafficking in the TVPA also distinguishes between smuggling and trafficking. Human smuggling is the movement of migrants across borders illegally. Both smugglers and those being smuggled are subject to legal action. Human trafficking is distinguished from smuggling in this legislation by the presence of “force, fraud, or coercion.” A major difference between the TVPA and the international formulation of trafficking in the Trafficking Protocol, is the absence in the TVPA of any mention of victim consent (Chacón, 2006). Victim consent becomes an issue because the line between smuggling and trafficking is often blurred. Many trafficked persons may start out as voluntary migrants and then fall into situations of trafficking during some stage of their migration (Chapkis, 2003). The Trafficking Protocol provides protection in this situation by stating that consent at some point during this process does not invalidate a person’s status as a victim of trafficking (Chacón, 2006). Because the TVPA makes no mention of consent, courts are able to take a more or less inclusive view of trafficking. The more inclusive view would allow victims access to protection regardless of whether they consented to some part of the trafficking process. While the conflict over including prostitution as a form of trafficking has received the most critical attention, Chacón (2006) points out that this issue of consent was also debated hotly.

The enforcement of trafficking laws in the United States to date has not reflected this broad understanding of trafficking. This is likely due in part to the fact that some members of Congress were quite vocal in their desire to exclude from the Act’s protections any victims who consented to some aspect of his or her transportation or employment. Their concern seemed to be that migrants might use the TVPA to obtain immigration benefits after
participating in their own smuggling (Chacón, 2006, p. 18-19).

With regard to human trafficking the TVPA has three major objectives: 1) to prevent human trafficking; 2) to prosecute traffickers; and 3) to protect victims of trafficking. See Table 1 for some of the more relevant provisions created by the TVPA under each of these objectives. Depending on a stakeholder’s specific role in working in the area of human trafficking he/she may have knowledge of some or all of these provisions.

Table 1. Important Provisions of the TVPA 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
<td>Calls for the development of international plans to create economic opportunities for potential victims in source countries (Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides research funding to better understand the causes and mechanisms of human trafficking (Clawson et al., 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call for the creation of public awareness programs to inform potential victims of the risks of trafficking (Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes an Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking housed in the Department of State (Clawson et al., 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires the Secretary of State, with the help of this Task Force to produce an annual review of international anti-trafficking efforts by country (Clawson et al., 2003; Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides the use of economic sanctions for other Nations who do not demonstrate an effort to address human trafficking in their countries (Clawson et al., 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosecution</strong></td>
<td>Expands the definition of coercion to include psychologically coercive acts, rather than just physical force (Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifically prohibited withholding documents to coerce employees (Chacón, 2006; Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased penalties for traffickers, including financial penalties, such as forfeiture of property and mandatory restitution to victims (Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows for witness protection provisions for those cooperating in federal cases (Stolz, 2007).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection

Provides financial assistance to victim programs in other countries (Stolz, 2007).

Provides benefits for victims of trafficking under the umbrella of the Office of Refugee Resettlement if they are “certified” through the Department of Health and Human Services. These benefits include “employment authorization, housing, mental health services, medical care and Supplemental Security Income (Clawson et al., 2003, p. 4).”

Created a T-visa, which allows certified Victims of trafficking who cooperate with federal law enforcement the right to remain in the U.S. for three years. After these three years victims may be eligible to obtain a Green card (Chacón, 2006).

Made grants available to for the development of victims service programs in the U.S. (Stolz, 2007).

The Act required that Congress revisit the provisions of the TVPA in 2003, which resulted in the 2003 Reauthorization Act. Subsequent reauthorizations were passed in 2005 and 2007/2008. There have been many critics of the TVPA itself (see especially Chacón, 2006 and Chapkis, 2003 below). Some of the main critiques raised by academics will be discussed below in the section covering academia. However, some scholars also seem especially critical of these subsequent reauthorizations to the TVPA. I will highlight some of the more controversial aspects of the reauthorizations. The overarching concern, shared by several authors (Bales & Soodalter, 2009; Brennan, 2008; DeStefano, 2007; Stolz, 2007), is that human trafficking policy through subsequent reauthorizations has continued to shift away from its original intent to help vulnerable migrants who have been exploited in forced labor and forced prostitution. These authors are concerned that trafficking discourse and policy is increasingly being used as an anti-prostitution tool.

Perhaps the most controversial change occurred in the 2003 reauthorization. This Act included an amendment that made federal grant funding for trafficking
victims’ services contingent on a public declaration affirming that the applying agency does not “promote, support, or advocate the legislation or practice of prostitution” (Stolz, 2007, p. 321). This funding restriction (sometimes called the “Prostitution Pledge”) applies to all agencies, regardless of whether they are likely to work with women in the sex industry or not, and raised concern among some agencies that making such statements against prostitution may alienate some of the very people they were trying to help (DeStefano, 2007).

While less controversial than the “prostitution pledge,” the 2005 and 2007/2008 reauthorizations also drew criticism for taking further steps toward using federal funding to address domestic sex trafficking and prostitution at the expense of labor trafficking (Brennan, 2008). Denise Brennan (2008), who has worked with migrant workers, formerly trafficked workers, and migrant workers’ rights groups, highlights one consequence of this shift in funding:

> These migrants’ rights organizations grew out of grassroots community needs, in collaboration with community partners, not out of moral or funding imperatives. With the rise of startup antiprostition organizations, migrants’ rights groups and social-service agencies that specialize in working with foreign exploited workers in industries other than the sex industry have been replaced at many policy tables and anti-trafficking conferences by these newer, less experienced organizations (Brennan, 2008, p. 53).

We can see from the criticism surrounding these reauthorizations that the controversy and confusion surrounding human trafficking continues to plague policy debates and the enactment of trafficking policy. Far from clarifying the issue of what human trafficking is and who is a victim, the TVPA and its reauthorizations seem to continue to be the center of a debate that is confusing and contentious. Potocky (2010a) laments:
Furthermore, an Orwellian use of language pervades the policy discourse. To give a few examples, the policy defines *human trafficking* as “a form of modern-day slavery,” yet no other forms are identified; it defines “severe forms of trafficking” but does not specifically define nonsevere forms; “trafficking” is not synonymous with “movement,” as it is in common usage; and the term “abolition” has been co-opted such that it now refers to the eradication of prostitution, not the eradication of slavery. Such linguistic obfuscations confuse the public and service providers and, together with the other biases, impede an evidence-based policy foundation (p. 373).

**Media Context**

The policy debate over how to define and legislate human trafficking has been fueled, in part, by media coverage of human trafficking. The media has played a major role in bringing the problem of human trafficking to the attention of the general population and likely influenced Congress to address the issue. Because depictions of human trafficking in the media often claim to represent objective “reality”, they can have serious implications for public policy. In their book, *Constructing Crime: Perspectives on Making News And Social Problems*, Kappeler & Potter (2006) examine how “the reality of crime in the United States has been blanketed by constructed reality (p.1)” and reflect on how powerful these constructed realities can be:

> Crime myths are not just curiosities or examples of sloppy work by journalists. They have tangible and serious policy implications. Spurred by crime mythology, politicians clamor for ever tougher sanctions against criminals. Crime myths divert attention away from the social and cultural forces that cause crime and toward individual pathologies; they reinforce stereotypes of minorities, poor people, and people who are “different.” (Kappeler & Potter, 2006, p. 11)

The perspective offered here by Kappeler and Potter is useful in that it encourages us to look at the constructed nature of crime and the power the media has to perpetuate
certain discourses about crime at the expense of others. In this vein, several authors have criticized the way human trafficking has been constructed by the media (Berman, 2005; Brennan, 2008; Cheng, 2008).

In her article, “Muckraking and stories untold: Ethnography meets journalism on trafficked women and the U.S. Military”, Cheng (2008) examines the depictions of trafficking victims as represented in a particular investigative news report by Fox News. The report, aired in 2002, covered U.S. military involvement in “human trafficking” in South Korea. In it an undercover investigative reporter talks with Filipina and Russian women working in a Korean “club” frequented by U.S. military servicemen stationed at a nearby base. This particular report was specifically used by U.S. government officials to directly influence the creation of Department of Defense anti-trafficking policy. Of the particular power the media has in disseminating human trafficking discourses, Cheng (2008) writes:

The *truth power* (the claim to objectify and, therefore, to legitimate) of the visual media has allowed investigative journalism in the form of news and documentary films—exclusively focused on the trafficking of women and children into forced prostitution—to dominate public discourse, university campuses, and policy debates about trafficking (p.8).

Using her previous ethnographic field research from the very towns that were the subject of this report, Cheng questions many of the assumptions implicit in the Fox News report and highlights the complexity of the situation in which many of the Russian and Filipina women find themselves at these Korean clubs. While she acknowledges that many of the women are subject to exploitative practices, Cheng also challenges the over-simplistic construction of them in the one-dimensional role of victim. She writes, “However, unlike the many activist discourses that stress these
women’s powerlessness, many of them prefer to see themselves as autonomous agents exercising control over their bodies and their sexuality” (Cheng, 2008, p.15). Cheng’s work provides an excellent example of the power the media has to perpetuate some discourses (helpless women being exploited by drunken servicemen) about women in the sex industry at the expense of others (a more complicated story where women have some agency in the process).

Likewise, Brennan (2008) has criticized coverage of the 2006 World Cup tournament, where stories claimed that up to one million women were being imported to Germany (where prostitution is legal) for the event, as well as a human trafficking focused series on Lifetime as “sensationalistic” and “shoddy reporting.” According to Brennan (2008), the lack of research on trafficking, combined with a lack of research on criminality among young girls, makes these representations particularly powerful. Citing Schaffner (2006), she highlights the discrepancies between media portrayals of young girls and the actual numbers of girls being arrested. According to crime data, girls are arrested for aggravated assaults far more frequently than prostitution. Yet the portrayal of girls in the media is typically one of “girls and women in crisis” (Schaffner, 2006). This echoes Cheng’s (2008) concern about the one-dimensional portrayal of women in the Fox news story. Not only does this type of media coverage construct questionable discourses about women, but in doing so often fails to address other kinds of abuses that occur under the rubric of human trafficking. In “the raw spectacle-making of violence, abuse, and suffering” (Brennan, 2008), the less glamorous, but more typical stories of the exploitation of economic migrants and undocumented workers (including sex workers) go unheard.
Berman (2005) and Brennan (2008) both criticize one particular article featured in the New York Times Magazine: “Sex Slaves on Main Street: The Girls Next Door” (Landesman, 2004) as having particularly problematic depictions of human trafficking. Berman describes the article as a “hystericized” portrayal of human trafficking with young innocent girls as the victims and large international crime syndicates as the perpetrators who kidnapped and enslaved them. This is an example of the power of the “crime myth” that surrounds human trafficking. In reality, only a small number of trafficked persons have been physically kidnapped (Chapkis, 2003) and the early perception that trafficking in the United States is the result of large groups of organized criminals failed to materialize (DeStefano, 2007). Berman (2005) writes:

This Article, of course, does not argue that [a certain media outlet] is complicit with conservative Christians or abolitionist feminists. Nor, as suggested, does it dismiss in any way the extreme abuse and exploitation that many women experience as trafficking victims or may experience in the course of seeking any type of work abroad. What this Article does want to suggest is that a conflation of human trafficking and sexual slavery now dominates public accounts of, and U.S. policies on, human trafficking. As such, these accounts delimit the degree to which the complexities of human trafficking can be generally understood, much less adequately addressed (p. 289).

In his book, The War on Human Trafficking: U.S. Policy Assessed, Anthony DeStefano (2007) provides a useful inside look at one journalist’s reflection on how the media covers human trafficking. He admits that due to the quick turnover of news stories, most journalists have not covered human trafficking in enough detail, opting instead to cover the most extreme and eye-catching cases. In eerie resonance with Cheng’s (2008) description of the Fox News report of trafficking in Korea, DeStefano
(2007) goes on to describe the “predictable storyline” that is played out in media coverage of human trafficking,

...vulnerable person meets criminal entrepreneur and is then tricked into a life of unspeakable servitude, finally to be freed by intrepid investigators. In a way, the formulaic approach to such stories isn’t surprising as Christopher Bookers has noted in The Seven Basic Plots: Why We Tell Stories, overcoming the monster (in this case, the trafficker) is a standard plot line (p. xxvi).

Cheng’s (2008) analysis of this trope also highlights the role of investigative reporter as hero and white knight rescuing the helpless victim by bringing the “truth” to light.

It should be noted, however, that some journalists have attempted to provide coverage of trafficking that is not in step with the “overcoming the monster” plot line. DeStefano (2007) himself is a good example of this kind of reporting. As mentioned above, he has published a book looking at the more complicated issues of U.S. Policy on human trafficking, issues that may not fit neatly into catchy headlines. Other reporters, like Thrupkaew (2012) in a recent article entitled “A Misguided Moral Crusade,” also provide a critique of the depiction of women and sex work that is offered by some segments of the anti-trafficking movement. However, this kind of reporting seems like a minority voice in the media.

While many academics have presented concerns over media portrayals of human trafficking, a few anti-trafficking scholars have used the popular press to bring attention to human trafficking and thus, attempt to change or shape media discourses. Most notable among these is Kevin Bales. He has written several popular press books on the subject and has been cited often in both media and academic contexts. Two of his more popular books are Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy (Bales, 2004) about forced labor around the world and The Slave Next Door: Human Trafficking and
Slavery in America Today (Bales & Soodalter, 2009), addressing human trafficking in the U.S. These works, while including interviews and research akin to academic work, seem to be written more with the general public in mind as the audience. In them he avoids some of the more garish tropes of trafficking that are mentioned above and clearly distinguishes human trafficking from prostitution, setting it in the context of poor labor regulations and flawed immigration policies. However, he also appears to appeal to the public through highly evocative language such as “disposable people” and “new slavery.”

He uses sympathetic stories of trafficking cases and detailed depictions of the abuses victims have endured. While generating attention to the cause on one hand, this portrayal may perpetuate the “victimness” of trafficked persons and may continue to cast the researcher/advocate/academic in the role of hero in the ways it tells these stories.

Academia and Human Trafficking

Like public policy and the media, academia has an inherent power and authority in shaping discourses about social problems. The education and prestige of academics gives their voices some weight in discussions about human trafficking. There are two major streams of academic contributions to our conceptions of the issue. One is the work of legal, feminist, and public policy scholars. The other stream comes out of the social sciences. There is some overlap in the kinds of literature produced by these two spheres of academia, but for the most part, the publications produced by these two groups are drastically different.

Legal and feminist scholars have concerned themselves mainly with critiquing the human trafficking debate and the international and national approaches to addressing it. Some examples of this work have already been discussed (see especially
Chuang, 2006). In contrast, social science research is largely silent on the more controversial issues of human trafficking (See Brennan, 2008 and Potocky, 2010a, for notable exceptions). Funded mostly by government bodies or advocacy groups, social science academics have focused on exploring the dimensions of the phenomenon of human trafficking. They have attempted to describe the extent of trafficking, the demographics of both trafficked persons and traffickers, and the needs of formerly trafficked persons upon emancipation from trafficking.

Thus, literature about human trafficking in the United States is strikingly divided between those actively engaged in the meaning-making process by contributing critiques of the various discourses available to describe trafficking, and those who are more passively engaged in the discursive process by (knowingly or unknowingly) codifying certain discourses into “objective” social science research. As such, they provide different kinds of texts with different intents. In general, the intent of legal and feminist scholarship is to persuade the reader through philosophical or logical arguments; while the intent of social science scholarship is to inform the reader through the use of some sort of “objective” methodology. Since these texts have such drastically different intents and are likely to be consumed and incorporated into local ideas of human trafficking in very different ways and to different degrees, I examine them separately below.

**Social science scholarship.** Social science research texts are more likely to directly impact the discourses of local stakeholders than the legal and feminist texts. The work of scholars in the social sciences is often used to evaluate and shape public policy, and many of the major social sciences studies on human trafficking have been commissioned by federal agencies to do just that (Gozdziak & Collett, 2005). As federal
policy and practice recommendations derived from social science reports trickle down to local anti-trafficking coalitions, they are likely to have strong influences on how stakeholders conceptualize human trafficking. Given the potential influence that these documents have and their claim to objective truth, it is important to examine them closely. The body of major research studies produced in the social sciences on trafficking in the U.S. is limited and, thus can be presented in a complete list. Table 2 shows this list of major reports, along with funding sources and sponsoring agency, location and population of the survivors the reports attempted to study, and the methods used. Each of these factors is important to determining the soundness and usefulness of the study. However, they can often be overlooked when the reports are consumed and used to make policy and practice recommendations.

Table 2. Chronological Presentation of Major Social Science Studies on Human Trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title, Author, Year</th>
<th>Organization &amp; Funding</th>
<th>Population &amp; Location</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>International Trafficking in Women to the United States: A Contemporary Manifestation of Slavery and Organized Crime.</em> (Richard, 1999)</td>
<td>Produced by the CIA</td>
<td>National, no specific population</td>
<td>Not explicitly stated, appears to be interviews with government employees, law enforcement, and service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sex Trafficking of Women in the United States: International and Domestic Trends</em> (Raymond et al., 2001)</td>
<td>Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW), National Institute of justice funded</td>
<td>Metro San Fran. Metro NYC N. Midwest, Northeast, Southeast, Sex trafficking, domestic and international</td>
<td>Interviews with: -survivors (international, 16 &amp; domestic, 25) -law enforcement (N=32) -social service workers (N=43) -academics and journalists -health care workers (N=43) Comments from a website in which men discussed their experiences of purchasing sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Sample/Setting</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment for Service Providers and Trafficking Victims</td>
<td>National Institute of Justice</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Phone survey with a sample of 98 service providers, 20 person service provider focus group, and 6 person labor trafficking survivor group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Trafficking: Victims' Voices in Florida</td>
<td>Florida Department of Children and Families Office of Refugee Resettlement</td>
<td>Florida, female survivors of human trafficking (10 sex and 1 labor)</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews with survivors (N=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Slaves Forced Labor in the United States</td>
<td>Free the Slaves organization and the Human Rights Center at the University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>National, including both sex and labor trafficking cases</td>
<td>-phone survey with 49 service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-review of newspaper articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-performed eight in-depth case studies of known forced labor incidents in different regions of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking in Persons in the United States</td>
<td>National Institute of Justice</td>
<td>Southwest Florida, Chicago, and Washington, DC, both sex and labor</td>
<td>In-depth case study of 12 trafficking cases including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-conducting interviews with victims, agencies, and community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-reviewing medical and psychological assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-law enforcement reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-court records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-immigration documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Human Trafficking in the Midwest</td>
<td>Mid-America Institute on Poverty of Heartland Alliance, funded by Office of Victims of Crime in the Department of Justice</td>
<td>Chicago human trafficking service site and its surrounding Midwestern states, both sex and labor.</td>
<td>Lack of clear information about the methods used. Included “geographic data analysis” using census data and Office of Immigrant Statistics to assess areas that might be vulnerable to human trafficking. Also used a chart review, but no information given about this review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Services for Survivors of Human Trafficking: Findings from Clients in Three Communities (Aron, Zweig, &amp; Newmark, 2006)</strong></td>
<td>The Urban Institute: Justice Policy Center in collaboration with Caliber with funding by National Institute of Justice Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Miami, pre-certified international survivors Interviews with survivors of trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Comprehensive Services for Victims of Human Trafficking: Key Findings and Lessons Learned (Caliber, 2007)</strong></td>
<td>Caliber Associates (now ICF International) funded by National Institute of Justice Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Miami pre-certified international survivors Reviews of the grant applications, telephone, and face to face interviews with project coordinators and key partners Focus groups with key partners, surveys, and interviews with case managers and survivors of trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Trafficking in Ohio: Markets, Responses, and Considerations (Wilson &amp; Dalton, 2007)</strong></td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs in the state of Ohio through a grant provided to the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police Ohio, labor and sex trafficking Content analysis of newspaper articles and interviews with key criminal justice officials and service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shattered Hearts: The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of American Indian Women and Girls in Minnesota (Pierce, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Minnesota Indian Women’s Resource Center with funding by the W.K. Kellogg foundation Minnesota, American Indian women, sex trafficking exclusively Two regional round table discussions with community advocates, data from screening forms used by the Minnesota Indian Women’s Resource Center, review of other published materials available on the subject, and review of data provided by other entities (e.g., government and non-profit organizations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness of Services for Victims of International Human Trafficking: An Exploratory Evaluation (Potocky, 2010a)</strong></td>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime Florida, international survivors Mixed quantitative-qualitative methodology consisting of client chart review and a key informant interview with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the number of social science studies produced on human trafficking is fairly small, each individual study has significant potential to influence local practices and discourse. Perhaps because of the relative power this gives each study, academic authors (from legal, feminist, and social science backgrounds) cite the need for more research and better understanding of the phenomenon of human trafficking (Androff, 2011; Brennan, 2005; Gozdziak & Collett, 2005; Potocky, 2010a; Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). However, because social science research intends to inform about some of the concrete phenomena related to human trafficking they face some particular challenges that legal and feminist authors usually do not face when writing about human trafficking. These challenges have limited and shaped the studies listed in Table 2.

The most pivotal challenge faced by these researchers is the definitional controversy that has been discussed at length in this proposal. When it comes to numerating, explaining, and characterizing the phenomenon of human trafficking it becomes clear that the issue of how to define human trafficking takes on critical importance. Several authors have noted that a lack of consensus on the definition of human trafficking has muddied and limited the usefulness of the research produced thus far (Androff, 2011; Gozdziak & Collett, 2005). Even if research products operate under the same (legal) definition of human trafficking, as is the case in many government funded research reports, “paradoxically, the existence of a legal definition of trafficking in persons does not necessarily mean that the term is uniformly operationalized” (Gozdziak & Collett, 2005, p. 106).

In contrast to work in the legal and feminist arenas of academia, the research produced in the social sciences is often noticeably silent about the controversy surrounding human trafficking. It is understandable that researchers working through
government funded grants would want to seem more objective about human trafficking, and thus would work from the legal definition without addressing the controversy surrounding it. In the process, many of the research reports produced by social scientists seem to lack an explicit framework to encapsulate the phenomenon of human trafficking. Without an agreed upon framework, a coherent attempt to systematically investigate the variables related to trafficking is relatively pointless. Caraway (2005) highlights the multitude of theoretical frameworks used to conceptualize human trafficking:

Because human trafficking is comprised of so many discreet steps, it is difficult to encapsulate all of the variables in one agreed-upon framework. Trafficking can be defined in a number of different ways: as a legal problem, a human rights problem, a religious or moral issue, a gender issue, a child labor problem, a migration problem, a public health issue, a feature of multinational crime—or an amalgamation of several or even all of these. Likewise, the feature of trafficking emphasized will dictate what solutions are posited and ultimately, which are necessary. Whether trafficking is a problem of organized crime, labor and immigration, or a moral issue affects how it is presented by the media and addressed by policy-makers (pg 311).

Thus, how a researcher conceptualizes the problem of human trafficking is intimately related to the recommendations he or she makes to address issues of policy or practice. If these conceptualizations are either not explicitly recognized, or are not stated transparently, it makes the various research reports and their recommendations difficult to evaluate and compare.

In addition to these fundamental definitional and conceptual issues, there are a number of other challenges involved with attempts to conduct social science research on the issue of human trafficking. Specifically, there are challenges related to the nature of
the “population” of trafficked and formerly trafficked persons that create methodological issues for researchers attempting to study them. This group is hidden, idiosyncratic, and vulnerable.

The first population-related challenge is that the sample is a hidden population, which Tyldum and Brunovskis (2005) describe as a group of individuals for whom the size and boundary is unknown and for whom no sampling frame exists. Often victims and survivors have been involved in illegal activity such as prostitution or irregular migration resulting in an undocumented status. They are often poor, unaware of their rights, possibly unable to speak English well, and know little about how to access help (Caraway, 2005). Many are wary of police and may go to great lengths to avoid detection by service providers or authorities.

Current data sources where victims of trafficking can be unambiguously identified (i.e. data from law enforcement and rehabilitation centres) do not cover more than a small proportion of the total population of victims of trafficking. The populations that are covered are mostly likely marked by strong selection bias, and are not representative of the total population of victims. Due to a lack of empirical knowledge about causes and mechanisms tied to trafficking, proxy (or process) indicators such as poverty, migration patterns, or missing persons have limited application for estimating size of the population of trafficking victims (p.30).

Not only does this make trafficked persons extremely difficult to find, but it makes quantification of the extent of trafficking highly problematic (Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). Several authors have noted the difficulty of estimating the prevalence of trafficking (Androff, 2011; Gozdziak & Collett, 2005; Potocky, 2010a). Potocky (2010b) has discussed the wide variability of government estimates, noting that estimates of the number of persons trafficked into the U.S. each year began at 50,000 in 2000, dropped to 18,000-20,000 in 2003, and then to 14,500-17,500 in 2004. She noted
that none of these estimates included information regarding the methods involved in
deriving the numbers. Androff (2011) has also written about the wide variation of
estimates coming from different sources and noted that estimates produced by non-
profit advocacy groups may overinflate the problem and estimates produced by
government bodies may downplay the problem, as each may be biased by political
motivations to either increase recognition and funding on the one hand, or decrease
responsibility and funding on the other hand.

Despite the limitations in prevalence estimates Tyldum & Brunovskis (2005)
have noted in using the “unambiguously identified” victims, such as those who have
received media coverage, have been identified by law enforcement, or have been
certified by the Department of Health and Human Services, Table 2 shows that many of
the major social science research reports use these kinds of methods. In reviewing
human trafficking research in North America, Gozdziak and Collett (2005) noted that
most of the studies they found drew information from newspaper articles, information
on high-profile cases that have been prosecuted at the federal level, and interviews with
“intermediaries.” They echo Tyldum & Brunovskis (2005) in their concern that these
sources are biased.

It may even be misleading to refer to trafficked persons as a single “population”.
The research that has been produced using these “unambiguously identified” case
studies has revealed that, in fact, trafficking cases have been extremely idiosyncratic
(Bales et al., 2004; Bales & Lize, 2005; Brennan, 2005). This presents a second major
challenge for social science researchers. Trafficked persons and their traffickers are
demographically diverse in age, ethnicity, source country, and education. The ways in
which traffickers have exploited their victims are also extremely diverse, ranging from
large groups of trafficked persons being forced into prostitution, panhandling, factory, or agricultural work to one to two trafficked persons being used as domestic workers or restaurant staff (Bales & Lize, 2005). Here in Hawai‘i, one of the first trafficking cases to gain attention was a Tongan pig farmer who exploited a handful of fellow Tongans in work on his pig farm and in his landscaping business (Bales & Soodalter, 2009).

This variability limits the kinds of research that can be conducted. Often generalizability is illusive. Brennan (2005) concludes that researchers can draw some “general portraits” based on these diverse cases of trafficking, but that “indeed, some trafficking cases are so vastly different from one another that it may not be instructive to draw many connections among them” (p. 39). Gozdziak and Collett (2005) noted that often because of the diversity and relative scarcity of trafficking cases researchers are forced to choose between “an in-depth study of a particular geographic region” and “a more scattered approach.” In the case of the former, it is more difficult to draw generalizable conclusions; In the case of the latter, the diversity of detail and context may be lost.

A third major challenge that faces social science researchers is that formerly trafficked persons are an extremely vulnerable population, and as such, researchers have had difficulty getting their proposals approved through Internal Review Boards (Brennan, 2005) and obtaining access to survivors (Aron et al., 2006; Brennan, 2005). These authors have both described experiences in which service providers were reluctant to allow researchers access to their clients. While this reluctance is perhaps understandable, formerly trafficked persons, as an extremely vulnerable population also fall into what O’Neill (1989) calls the accountability gap:

The accountability gap occurs when the group whose vulnerable position leads us to champion it is too weak,
too large, too diffuse, or too anonymous to take us to task for our actions. We usually solve the problem by reporting to a group which we assume represents the interests of the vulnerable group (p. 331).

When vulnerable groups fall into this accountability gap there is a danger that researchers, politicians, and advocate groups will speak for them in ways that do not represent the true values or opinions of the group. Denise Brennan (2005) has noted the particular absence of the perspective of formerly trafficked persons in trafficking research. This makes it difficult for researchers to adequately address the interests of a group that is both diverse and difficult to access.

These challenges have shaped and limited the social science research studies listed in Table 2, but there are also additional moral and political concerns about some of these studies. In general they have attempted to assess the extent of human trafficking in the United States, the needs of human trafficking survivors, and the adequacy of the services provided to them. Most are large studies funded by either government agencies or foundations and conducted by either a consulting agency (e.g., Caliber Associates) or by a non-profit agency (e.g., Minnesota Indian Women’s Resource Center, Free the Slaves, CATW). The fact that most of these studies were not peer-reviewed (Coonan, 2004 and Potocky, 2010b provide notable exceptions), coupled with the fact that they were conducted either at the request of the government (e.g., Caliber, 2007; Clawson et al., 2003; Richard, 1999) or an interested non-profit agency (e.g., Bales et al., 2004; Pierce, 2009; Raymond et al., 2001) could be problematic. The conclusions and recommendations of these studies may be skewed by the potential bias of the groups producing them. Due to the limited availability of social science research studies, they are also highly interrelated. Often ideas about trafficking (even those
without clear empirical backing) put forth in earlier studies become legitimated through
citation and repetition in later studies.

Few of the studies include the voices of the formerly trafficked persons they seek
to speak for (Aron et al., 2006; Brennan, 2005; Coonan, 2004 are notable exceptions). It
could be argued that the preoccupation of social science researchers with assessing the
needs of survivors means that their voices are included in the studies “solely to confirm
their victimhood rather than to engage them as interlocutors” (Cheng, 2008). A notable
exception to this may be the work of Denise Brennan (2005, 2008, 2010), who has
advocated for formerly trafficked persons to have more of a voice in human trafficking
research and advocacy efforts.

However, despite these limitations, as a body of research these studies do present
a consistent picture of the many needs of human trafficking survivors. Many of the
studies discuss issues related to the ability of agencies to meet these needs and provide
recommendations for addressing these limitations (Aron et al., 2006; Clawson et al.,
2003; Coonan, 2004; Potocky, 2010a). In addition to trying to understand and meet the
needs of survivors, several of the studies attempted to estimate the prevalence of human
trafficking (Bales et al., 2004; Wilson & Dalton, 2007). As discussed above, Tyldum and
Brunovskis (2005) presented serious methodological concerns around attempting to
estimate the extent of human trafficking using cases identified by law enforcement or
the media. Thus, while these studies likely do not fully speak to the prevalence of human
trafficking in the U.S., all show that human trafficking does exist in many forms in
diverse areas of the country from New York City to Minnesota to San Francisco, among
others, including Hawai‘i. Given the fact that human trafficking is such an egregious
human rights abuse being perpetrated in many cities throughout the United States,
certainly much more research is needed to explore not just the extent of human trafficking or its consequences to the lives of formerly trafficked persons, but how complex structural elements in our society both create vulnerabilities for abuse and prevent us from fully addressing the problem.

**Legal and feminist scholarship.** Legal and feminist academics have been active in the more theoretical assessment of the structural, legal, and political aspects of human trafficking. They have been more overtly involved in the meaning-making process through criticizing and shaping how the concept of human trafficking is defined, discussed, and categorized. They are often concerned with the language and discourses used in discussing and addressing human trafficking. This concern makes their observations particularly useful in examining how human trafficking is talked about at the local level and the underlying implications of this talk.

However, the relatively abstract and philosophical nature of this work may make it inaccessible to local stakeholders. It is, therefore, unlikely that these texts *directly* influence how stakeholders discuss human trafficking. Legal and feminist texts are more likely to deal with discourses, structural causes, and definitional frameworks at an abstract level which, while indirect, are no less powerful in shaping local discourses.

There is no expectation that we are aware of the discourses we use to construct people and objects...the discourses deployed may be expected to reflect the powerful and prevailing cultural and institutional understandings, rather any personal choice. [Critical discourse analysis] seeks to uncover these discourses, and in so doing, to help us understand how we construct knowledge and experience (Hollin & Larkin, 2011, p.2199).

It is their attention to these “prevailing cultural and institutional understandings” that makes the following research studies so useful in examining human trafficking
discourses. However, given that they are unlikely to be individually and directly used by interviewees, I intend to highlight some of the critiques that may be useful in an analysis of the implications of interviewee discourse, instead of providing an exhaustive presentation of these texts.

Unlike many of the reports produced in the social sciences, legal and feminist scholars have often explicitly examined the framework(s) employed in discussing human trafficking. Many legal scholars that have written about human trafficking have critiqued either the international legal framework under which human trafficking is addressed or the national framework of the TVPA. For instance, Chuang (2006) has criticized international counter-trafficking strategies as focusing primarily on prosecuting trafficking offenders to the detriment of prevention strategies. She writes that given the bleak economic outlook for many people in the developing world and the need for cheap labor in the developed world, current prevention efforts that focus primarily on public awareness campaigns about the risks of trafficking are unlikely to be effective. She highlights two particular trends in anti-trafficking policies that “promote a narrow conception of trafficking that diverts attention from its broader labor and migration causes and implications” (Chuang, 2006, p. 152). The first is a movement away from a focus on the transit or recruitment elements of the trafficking definition. The second is the emphasis on sex trafficking at the expense of labor trafficking.

In her assessment of international approaches to trafficking she concludes that these two trends, combined with the “law and order” emphasis to most countries’ trafficking policies, prevent nations from examining and addressing the socioeconomic root causes of human trafficking. She makes two major recommendations to improve trafficking prevention strategies. First, she advocates for an empirical assessment of
current policies to determine their effectiveness. Second, she recommends the use of a human rights framework to better address the socioeconomic “root causes” of trafficking, specifically the economic vulnerability of the migrants. She states that the economic, social, and cultural rights pieces of the human rights framework offer a “legal and political space for the disenfranchised to begin to claim these needs as rights, and thereby bring the scope of state responsibility into sharper focus” (Chuang, 2006, p. 157).

Similarly, Hathaway (2008) is critical of the international approach to human trafficking specifically codified in the Trafficking Protocol. His criticisms go a step farther than Chuang’s. Whereas Chuang (2006) mainly critiques the lack of focus on preventative measures in the document; Hathaway (2008) questions the usefulness of the trafficking protocol altogether, claiming that it may do more harm than good in the fight for human rights. He has three main criticisms of the international human trafficking policy: (1) By addressing a small subset of modern slavery (human trafficking) governments are able to appear active in the fight against slavery without addressing the more structural and systemic problems that allow exploitative practices within their borders; (2) Using the Organized Crime Convention (particularly the smuggling and human trafficking arms) governments have been able to justify tighter border control in the name of fighting human trafficking. This functionally increases the cost and danger of irregular migration and potentially facilitates higher instances of exploitation for migrants; and (3) The law enforcement focus on international cooperation in policing borders is likely to make refugees more vulnerable, since under international law they cannot claim asylum until they are within a state’s borders, thus most refugees rely on irregular routes of migration to acquire this asylum. Hathaway
(2008) argues that to the extent that the trafficking convention excuses states from addressing other forms of slavery, increases the cost and danger of irregular migration, and prevents refugees from acquiring asylum, it does considerable damage to international human rights.

However, in a response to Hathaway’s article, Gallagher (2009), who participated in the negotiations around the Trafficking Protocol as a representative of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, argues that the UN trafficking protocol is a positive step forward for human rights. She criticizes many of Hathaway’s assumptions related to both the way he defines human trafficking and the way he defines slavery. In considering the regional and national laws and agreements enacted in the wake of the Trafficking Protocol, Gallagher (2009) writes that the human trafficking framework laid out in the protocol and adopted in these other laws is useful in addressing multiple kinds of forced labor and exploitation whether it occurs within nations or across borders.

Other legal scholars have focused more particularly on U.S. anti-trafficking policy, but some of their critiques have been similar to those mentioned above. Chapkis (2003) argues that the TVPA (2000) “makes strategic use of anxieties over sexuality, gender and immigration to further curtail migration” (p. 923). She posits that in offering an exception to the penalties of immigration laws to a select few victims of “severe trafficking,” elected officials were able to make a politically strategic concession to some who have been exploited while strengthening the immigration policies that may enable that exploitation. In distinguishing trafficked persons as “innocent” migrants worthy of protection, she argues that a false dichotomy is set up that perpetuates a punishing system. She writes,
From this perspective, abuse of migrants becomes fully the fault of traffickers who must be stopped, not the by-product of exploitive employment practices, restrictive immigration policies, and vast economic disparities between rich and poor nations. Attempts to restrict immigration can then be packaged as antislavery measures; would-be migrants are would-be victims whose safety and well-being are ostensibly served by more rigorously policing of the borders (Chapkis, 2003, p. 927).

Chapkis's (2003) suggestion that the TVPA and related policies may function as a politically convenient diversion from the need to address the underlying causes of exploitation echo's one of Hathaway’s (2008) major concerns about international human rights and trafficking. To the extent that discourses on human trafficking are able separate it from the context of a continuum of abuses they may succeed in camouflaging these other abuses.

Chacón (2006) is also concerned with the ways in which U.S. immigration and labor laws enable some of these “other” abuses to flourish unaddressed by the TVPA. She provides a detailed analysis of the TVPA in the context of other labor, immigration, and sex trafficking laws and finds that the TVPA does little to address the shortcomings of these previous statutes. In addition to concerns over current immigration laws increasing migrants' vulnerability to trafficking by tightening border controls, Chacón (2006) discusses the ways in which U.S. labor laws effectively exclude undocumented workers from the protections designed to prevent workplace exploitation. In particular, two of her observations about the way in which human trafficking has been characterized in the U.S. are important to note. The first is that, as mentioned above, it has been used to describe extreme abuse in a way that separates it from the continuum of worker exploitation within which it exists.

As trafficking had been linked in the public imagination with child prostitution and sex tourism, it has been
decoupled from workplace abuses that may indeed amount to peonage and involuntary servitude. Congress's failure to discuss the possible expansion of the Thirteenth Amendment and Commerce Clause-based remedies to undocumented migrants cemented the idea that, rather than operating on a continuum, the abuse of laborers fell into two clear camps: virtual or actual enslavement, particularly sexual slavery, and "common" workplace violations unworthy of substantial new criminal punishment or victim remedies (Chacón, 2006, p. 24).

Second, she questions whether the racial dynamics and anti-immigrant flavor of past anti-trafficking laws, such as the Mann Act, are being perpetuated with the TVPA. She describes how U.S. corporations are far more likely to be prosecuted for smuggling offenses than trafficking offenses when worker exploitation cases arise.

But effective enforcement of anti-trafficking laws requires that these laws be enforced not just against politically unpopular noncitizens and immigrants, but also against U.S. citizen employers and domestic corporations. Otherwise, the TVPA, like the Mann Act that preceded it, runs the danger of becoming a tool used more often to incarcerate people of color and speed the deportation of noncitizens, than to free members of vulnerable immigrant groups from the grips of criminally self-interested economic actors (Chacón, 2006, p.25).

While local service providers are likely not intentionally reproducing ideas or categories that have these kinds of racial implications or that explicitly decouple trafficking from the other exploitative practices that enable it, powerful discourses that operate largely unnoticed may play into local discussions of human trafficking. It is therefore important to be aware of the potential implications of these kinds of discussions.

Like the legal scholars discussed above, feminist scholars have focused on characterizing the meaning and implications involved in how human trafficking is addressed internationally and nationally. However, feminist scholars have been more
interested in the debate over sex work and sex trafficking and the consequences this has for women worldwide. Several feminist critiques related to human trafficking have already been discussed in other sections (for example, see Cheng, 2008 and Stolz, 2007). One additional perspective is worth noting.

Regarding the anti-prostitution debate that has dominated much of human trafficking discourse, Barbara Sullivan (2003) argues that a sex work feminist approach to the issue has stronger “discursive and practical usefulness in advancing the position of both sex workers and victims of trafficking” (p. 67). She examines the implications of both the extreme feminist (anti-prostitution) position and the sex work feminist position. She concludes that the extreme feminist position, while it advances some important arguments about the ability of people in vulnerable positions to give full consent in potentially exploitative conditions, is overly universalistic in its presentation of women, sex, and sex work. She writes, “There is no room here for different accounts of ‘being a woman’ of different narratives about the meaning of prostitution transactions although we have abundant evidence that both of these vary enormously in different historical and cultural contexts” (p. 74). She argues that legalizing sex work, opening it to regulation, and allowing sex workers access to labor protections is practically useful in protecting women from abuse and discursively useful in acknowledging that some women have agency over their bodies, using sex work as an “economic and survival strategy” when there are few other options available.

In general, these legal and feminist authors present a view of the dominant human trafficking discourse(s) and approaches to policy that can be troubling from human rights and feminist standpoints. In some cases, it seems that human trafficking discourses can covertly maintain the power structure and status quo in developed
countries, for example, by providing a justification for more rigorous border control (Berman, 2003). However, “while discourses function as both an instrument and an effect of power in strategies of domination, they also form sites of resistance at which counter-strategies can be articulated and deployed” (Berman, 2003, p. 48). Several of these authors have dealt with the implications of human trafficking discourses (either explicitly or implicitly) at the national and international level. However, this heady realm of abstract ideas is far from the interests and concerns of those working to stop human trafficking and help formerly trafficked persons in the U.S. That said, how these various arguments, politics, and discourses become absorbed and used at the local level have yet to be examined.

** Trafficking in Hawai‘i **

Hawai‘i’s relative geographical remoteness, the presence of several high profile trafficking cases, and its unique socio-historical context make the state particularly interesting with regards to how local context shapes trafficking discourses. Hawai‘i is geographically isolated from the mainland of the U.S. Its remoteness may (or may not) provide a buffer from some of the more politically charged rhetoric that dominates the debate about human trafficking on the mainland. However, despite its geographical remoteness Hawai‘i is not immune to the effects of human trafficking, and in fact, may possess some characteristics that make it particularly susceptible to trafficking.

In the social science literature on human trafficking there often appears a list of regional characteristics that are thought to create increased risk for human trafficking, which includes: tourist areas, areas with military bases, areas with large immigrant communities, border areas, major ports of entry, and areas conducive to interstate travel (Clawson et al., 2003; Jones & Yousefzadeh, 2006; Raymond et al., 2001). As Hawai‘i
meets several of these characteristics, most notably tourism, military bases, and large immigrant communities, it could be considered a “hot spot” for trafficking. Although this list of regional characteristics is often repeated, it is not clear if it is based on empirical evidence. The earliest mention of these characteristics was made by Richard (1999) in her CIA monograph, but she made no explicit mention of her methodology in researching these aspects of trafficking. As this was one of the first social science-type research reports published, it was highly influential and often cited in other reports. Presumably, tourist and military areas are thought to have higher rates of prostitution, and areas with higher rates of prostitution are thought to have higher rates of human trafficking. This may be sound logical, but without clear empirical evidence these assumptions may perpetuate harmful stereotypes. Nevertheless, that they are so often repeated makes it likely that these assumptions have been incorporated into the story of human trafficking in Hawai‘i.

Whether or not these reports are accurate, Hawai‘i has had a number of high profile human trafficking cases in the last 10-12 years. In addition to the case involving labor exploitation of Tongan workers on the Waianae Coast in 2003 (mentioned earlier; Bales & Soodalter, 2009), Hawai‘i was also involved in providing services for some of the victims, mostly Chinese and Vietnamese women, of a very large labor trafficking case originating in an American Samoa garment factory in 2001 (Bales & Lize, 2005). Most recently, in two separate labor trafficking cases, Aloun Farms (2009) and Global Horizons (2010) were accused of exploiting Thai agricultural laborers (Niesse, 2011; The Associated Press, 2012) on Hawai‘i farms. The Global Horizons case was touted to be the largest labor trafficking case in U.S. history (The Associated Press, 2012). However, charges were dismissed in both cases.
In addition to several recent incidences of potential human trafficking in Hawai‘i, there are a few aspects of the local socio-historical context of Hawai‘i that are worthy of note regarding human trafficking. Hawai‘i, while having the full status of statehood since 1959, has a complex history of colonization and exploitation. Of specific relevance to human trafficking is the Islands’ plantation era. In her book, *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law*, Merry (1999) analyzes the role that Western-based legal systems played in colonizing Hawai‘i. In one chapter entitled, “The Social History of a Plantation Town,” she focuses on the town of Hilo on the Big Island and the ways in which sugar plantations came to transform it. Sugar is a very labor intensive crop. The ways in which she describes the labor system during these plantation days sound very much like modern definitions of human trafficking.

Merry (1999) describes the different immigrant waves that comprised the plantation labor system: Chinese 1852-1875, Portuguese 1877-1913, Japanese 1885-1907, Puerto Rican and Korean around 1900, and Filipinos from 1906-1934. She describes the “distinctive forms of discipline” used to maximize the production of each of these labor groups including “low pay, grim working and living conditions, brutal treatment by lunas (overseers), and quasi-slave contract labor systems [that] drove each group of immigrants out of the plantations as quickly as possible” (Merry, 1999, p.125). She also highlights the subtle ways in which the colonial legal system acted to uphold the power and rights of landowners at the expense of the various immigrant labor forces. It would seem then, that the colonial power that has partially shaped Hawai‘i’s current ethnic and economic make-up, was built upon practices of wide spread labor exploitation that resemble human trafficking. This historical context may play some role in determining how labor trafficking is conceptualized in Hawai‘i.
Similarly, Hawai‘i has a complicated past with regards to immigration and prostitution. Hori (1981) describes the Honolulu red light district of Iwilei and the high proportions of Japanese women whose professions were listed as “prostitution” at the turn of the last century. She notes how the importation of immigrant men for labor left a dearth of women and a situation in which prostitution thrived in a state that was semi-condoned by government regulations and the cordoning off of sex work to one section of the city, the infamous Iwilei. It is interesting to note that the arguments surrounding prostitution in Hawai‘i at the time are eerily similar to some of the debates that surround human trafficking today. They include the tightening of borders in the name of preventing women from immigrating for the purposes of prostitution; fears over the link between prostitution and organized crime among immigrant groups; the characterization of prostitution as “slavery;” and even the use of the term trafficking (Hori, 1981). Hori (1981) cites a statement made by a Maui sheriff in 1901 that illustrates some of these similarities:

In connection with Japanese the custom they have of trafficking [sic] in their women, buying and selling their wives is an evil that should be looked into, and if there is a remedy, it seems to me it should be earnestly sought and applied with a vigor, that would make practices of this nature, which are demoralizing and an outrage in a civillized [sic] community, impossible. [sic] Again there is little doubt that this is a fruitful source and to which cause might often be traced the motive of the most violent crimes that have been committed by Japanese on our Island. In support of this we have the case of Sagata, the wife and child murderer, who was actuated to commit a crime the most revolting of which we have any record, because he had only received one-half the price for his wife that had been agreed upon (p. 116).
It would seem from this sheriff’s statement that the argument made by some academics (e.g., Chacón, 2006) that human trafficking has been used in the past in a racialized way to limit the immigration of “dangerous foreigners” has some merit.

Hawai’i’s complicated past relationship with immigration, migrant labor, and prostitution may or may not inform today’s conception of human trafficking in the Islands. However, it is helpful to keep this history in mind when considering the context different stakeholders may bring to their discussions of human trafficking. Given this colonial history of governmental tolerance for exploitation, its resemblance to what is now defined as human trafficking, and the fact that a century ago people spoke of women “enslaved” in prostitution, it is unlikely that national discourses on human trafficking arrived in Hawai’i to find it a blank slate. It is precisely how these national discourses meet local conditions and get reflected, changed, or ignored in the context of Hawai’i that is the focus of this study.

**Discourse Analysis**

As discussed briefly above, the stance of discourse analysis, in general, is that language is not just reflective of an objective reality, but rather, it plays a vital and active role in helping to create meaning and in structuring social phenomena. Thus, rather than focusing on language alone, discourse analysis also examines the active “work” done by language in shaping social realities (Wood & Kroger, 2000). However, both Fairclough, (2003) and Parker (1992) are careful to note that this approach does not necessitate a completely constructivist view of the world. In other words, while discourse analysis does stress the importance of words in creating some kinds of realities (for instance what constitutes human trafficking), it does not necessarily claim
that words create all reality. Parker (1992) calls this “a critical realist position” which he defines as “a materialist view sensitive to the powers of discourse” (p. 25).

In this view, there are concrete, material aspects of human trafficking: the physical acts of abuse on the part of the traffickers, the existence of victims, the behaviors involved, etc. These physical aspects are open to scientific enquiry. However, in characterizing these social actors (as victims, traffickers, etc) and physical acts (as abuse or trafficking) one crosses into the realm of discourse and begins engaging in the process of socially constructing “human trafficking.” Parker (1992) writes:

This means that scientific knowledge is at once historically bounded, provisional, and is also practical, true. This tension is not to be resolved (as if it were a problem), for it is actually one of the conditions for the production of knowledge…There is no one-to-one relationship between a description and what it describes (p.27).

The social science research into trafficking to date has struggled to create a clear model of the concrete aspects of human trafficking. I would argue that this is due, in part, to a failure to acknowledge that the process of “human trafficking” is both a material reality and a discursively constructed one. Few researchers have explicitly acknowledged that the production of knowledge about trafficking is historically bound, rhetorically complicated, and politically charged. A critical realist position in general, and discourse analysis, in particular, can help make apparent some of the ways in which the construction of human trafficking on a local level is sensitive to these historical, political, and discursive aspects of meaning-making. In systematically exploring current local constructions of human trafficking and examining how certain power inequalities are maintained, this project seeks to put forth an explicit model of human trafficking that reflects the social justice values of community psychology. Modeling
the problem in this way is a step towards designing a concrete research agenda that is both clear about what variables are being investigated and thoughtful about the political and justice implications of the research products.

Wood & Kroger (2000) distinguish between three major schools of discourse analysis: conversation analysis (CA), discourse analysis in social psychology (DASP), and critical discourse analysis (CDA). They describe CA as the most microanalytical type of discourse analysis, focusing on the organization of talk in ways that stress the active use of language by participants to shape their social worlds. At the other end of the spectrum is critical discourse analysis (CDA), which Wood & Kroger (2000) characterize as macroanalytical. CDA is concerned with how discourses themselves shape social worlds. DASP is presented as a hybrid of CA and CDA in which the authors themselves draw on multiple schools of thought to use discourse analytic methods to address traditional social psychological concerns. In distinguishing CDA and CA, Wood & Kroger (2000) write:

These views are sometimes distinguished as “top-down” and “bottom-up,” respectively, because the former focuses upon language use in relation to broad cultural codes (the “discourse” of CDA), whereas the latter focuses upon situated utterances. The issues here are “central to ongoing debates about agency and constraint in social life; that is, the extent to which social realities and actions are products of individual initiative or are shaped by larger social forces” (Miller, 1997, p.37). But the views are not necessarily in conflict. It is possible to look at people in both ways, as “simultaneously the products and the producers of discourse” (Edley & Wetherell, p. 206) (p. 24).

In the case of discourse and human trafficking, the top-down approach of CDA is a useful tool to understand how local social realities related to human trafficking are shaped by “larger social forces” at the national and international level as well as the
socio-historical context. Wood & Kroger (2000) underscore the usefulness of the CDA type of discourse analysis for “understanding of discourse in relation to social problems; to social structural variables such as race, gender, and class; and above all to power (p.21).” Critical discourse analysis, rather than representing a single approach is more accurately described as a school or set of methods that share a focus on 1) the active nature of language in constructing social worlds; 2) a critical perspective, and 3) issues of power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

CDA’s focus on the active nature of language in constructing social understandings was discussed at the top of this section. In addition to this, CDA is also characterized by a focus on critical analysis of discourse. Researchers interested in critical methods in the tradition of the Frankfurt School seek to move beyond describing phenomena and adopt a stance of attempting to change or challenge existing injustices in society (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This focus moves scholars from a disimpassioned “objective” stance to a one that Bourdieu calls “scholarship with commitment” (Bourdieu, 2000). Van Dijk (2009) summarizes the implications of this “scholarship with commitment” in terms of analyzing discourse:

CDS [critical discourse studies] is not just any social or political research…but is premised on the fact that some forms of text and talk may be unjust. One of the tasks of CDS is to formulate the norms that define such ‘discursive injustice’. CDS aims to expose and combat such injustice…Such a research policy presupposes an ethical assessment, implying that discourse as social interaction may be illegitimate according to some fundamental norms, for instance those of international human and social rights. At the same time, critical analysis should be aware of the fact that such norms and rights change historically, and that some definitions of ‘international’ may well mean ‘Western’ (p.63, emphasis in original).
Specifically, this project proposes to use prospective critique, which focuses on a future-oriented analysis that seeks to shape a more just discourse on human trafficking (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). This ideal future discourse would need to discuss human trafficking in such a way that it can be situated within a systemic context, such as a “continuum of abuses” (as discussed above, Brennan, 2010; Chacón, 2006) suffered by low wage earners, immigrants, undocumented workers, or sex workers. To the extent that local discourse about human trafficking separates it from this continuum it is perpetuating what van Djik (2009) might call an unjust discourse.

A third major aspect of the CDA school of analysis is its focus on power. CDA researchers see these unjust discourses as maintaining and maintained by certain power interests. According to this view, “power is legitimized or de-legitimized in discourses. Texts are often sites of social struggle in that they manifest traces of differing ideological fights for dominance and hegemony” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p.89). In the case of human trafficking, global, local, and national power structures have an interest in maintaining a system that addresses extreme cases of abuse, while minimizing the discourse around the continuum of abuses. These entities profit from or are interested in promoting the unjust system which minimizes labor costs and maximizes profits, tightens borders and prevents migration, and minimizes transparency in labor and supply chains.

**Present Study**

The present study seeks to blend the approach used by legal and feminist scholars described above to examine the discursive and political aspects of human trafficking with the focus on the local context that qualitative social science methods can bring. The strength of many of the articles written by legal and feminist scholars is
their explicit focus on the underlying implications of how people define, describe, and legislate human trafficking and the power structures that they maintain. Given the contentious debate that surrounds human trafficking, the focus of social science research on producing objective descriptions about its characteristics may be premature and may even contribute to the ongoing confusion and imprecision surrounding human trafficking policies and initiatives.

Thus, social science research has floundered, attempting to achieve objectivity in a highly politically charged atmosphere. Using the foundation laid by the legal and feminist scholars who have examined some of the implications of human trafficking discourse, I examine how these discourses play out “on the ground” in Hawai‘i. This study adds to the body of research on human trafficking in a number of ways. First, it illuminates the local framework under which human trafficking efforts are enacted. While national legislation may set legal policy, its implementation in local contexts is variable. To be able to understand how human trafficking is addressed in Hawai‘i, therefore, we must look at how it is understood and discussed in a particular place and time. We must, therefore, understand the local discourses on human trafficking, or using Ian Parker's (1992) definition, the “sets of meanings” used locally to “constitute” the object of human trafficking. This is an important step if researchers intend to use the perspectives of stakeholders when studying the concrete aspects of human trafficking. Many of the social science research projects listed in Table 2 attempted to draw conclusions about the characteristics of human trafficking from interviews with various stakeholders. This can become problematic if careful attention is not paid to how these stakeholders conceptualize trafficking. In attempting to draw policy and practice conclusions from these interviews without considering the discursive context in
which they are created, many of these studies may unwittingly perpetuate discourses about human trafficking that are at odds with their intentions.

Second, by systematically examining the ways in which practitioners discuss human trafficking, this project can examine inconsistencies and omissions in their discourses that may undermine their overall goal of preventing and addressing human trafficking. This is not to point out the faults of the participants but to highlight social conventions that allow some discourses about human trafficking to be perpetuated while others are overlooked. In conducting this systematic discourse analysis in a critical way, this study highlights issues of power inequalities that lie within current discursive constructions of human trafficking and can provide alternative ways of discussing human trafficking that are more in line with the Community Psychology value of social justice. Using the tools of critical discourse analysis to form a deliberate and thoughtful approach to framing human trafficking issues could add to the effectiveness of local anti-trafficking efforts to advocate for just and effective policy. In order to accomplish these goals the Critical Discourse Analysis was framed around the following research questions:

**Research Questions**

1. How do the participants construct human trafficking discursively?
   a. What other discourse strands (immigration, women, labor etc) intersect with or are entangled in the discourse strand of human trafficking?
   b. What social actors are mentioned in the participants’ discourse on human trafficking and how are they constructed?

2. Is human trafficking seen as contextualized in a continuum of systemic abuses or as isolated incidences of aberrant behavior?
a. What are the power implications of contextualizing or decontextualizing human trafficking from a continuum of abuses?

b. What model of human trafficking might be constructed to allow for concrete investigation of human trafficking along a continuum of abuses?

Each of these questions will be expanded in the Analysis Section below.
Chapter 3. Methods

Study Design

This study used critical discourse analysis to examine the ways in which local stakeholders construct human trafficking. Local service providers were chosen because they have a more sophisticated understanding of trafficking than the public and are likely influential stakeholders with regards to how local human trafficking policy is implemented. When attempting to discover the way “ordinary people” (rather than more influential codifiers of discourse such as academics or journalists) construct meaning in relation to a particular topic, Willig (2008) recommends the use of semi-structured qualitative interviews or focus groups. Transcriptions of these interviews then become the texts that will be analyzed using the critical discourse analysis. In this study the interviewees were local service providers on the islands of O’ahu, Maui, and Hawai’i. In order to better understand the context of human trafficking in Hawai’i this study also intends to supplement the findings from the discourse analysis of these interviews with a content analysis of the same interviews and a review of recent local media representations of human trafficking in Hawai’i (see Supplemental Information section below).

Participants

Local service providers (N = 13) were interviewed from three different islands in the State of Hawai’i (O’ahu = 6; Maui = 3; Hawai’i = 4). Interviews were conducted in person and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Participants included advocates (n = 2) and service providers who have helped or are likely to help human trafficking victims with legal services (n = 6) or social services (n = 5). Participants who had experience with or knowledge of both sex trafficking and labor trafficking were
recruited for the project (sex = 5, labor = 5, both = 3). The majority of the participants were women (n = 10). There was a wide range in the participants’ years of experience with human trafficking related issues. Those on neighbor islands had very little direct experience with human trafficking as the relatively few trafficking victims located on those islands are typically referred to O‘ahu for help. Many of these individuals did have several years of experience in domestic violence or immigration relief services, but were fairly new to human trafficking issues. Several participants on O‘ahu had been involved with human trafficking issues since shortly after the TVPA was enacted in 2000, but a few were fairly new to this work. These participants were chosen in order to draw from a variety of experiences and backgrounds among service providers in Hawai‘i, and in doing so, to understand the similarities and differences that exist in their discourses on human trafficking.

Measures

Participants’ thoughts about human trafficking were solicited using semi-structured qualitative interviews. Wood & Kroger (2000), discuss the differences between typical qualitative interviews and those used for discourse analysis. While both use relatively unstructured questions, probes, and follow-up questions, the intent of those questions and probes is often quite different in discourse analysis. Wood & Kroger (2000) view the interviewers as active and engaged in the meaning making process during interviews. The interviewer seeks to “[take] the person seriously by responding to contributions in a way that permits him or her to consider possibilities and alternatives” (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 73). Because of these differences Wood &

---

1 In fact, as will be discussed later, upon arrival at one interview I learned that one participant did not actually have a full understanding of human trafficking. This participant and organization had been recommended to me as having experience in this area. However, as the participant did have experience in an area that is related to human trafficking, this interview was still analyzed.
Kroger (2000) recommend interview questions designed to encourage participants to “speak in relation to their own experience” rather than imposing the categories of the researcher.

Using this idea of eliciting experience as a guide, sample interview questions were designed (see Appendix A). However, given the active role of the researcher advocated for above, these questions were thought of as a loose guide. If participants spontaneously shared information on a topic of interest, the interviewer would elicit more information until that topic area was fully covered. This approach led to some “jumping around” with regards to the sequence of questions. However, regardless of sequence, all of the questions listed in Appendix A were fully covered during each interview.

Generally, the questions focused on how participants’ work in the area of human trafficking has changed over the years and their perspectives on what could improve their work in this area. Several initial questions gathered background and contextual information. These included, “In what area of human trafficking do you have experience working?” and “How long have you been involved with human trafficking issues?” These initial questions were generally followed by asking participants about the challenges they face in their work with regards to human trafficking. Follow-up probes related to challenges usually included questions about challenges specific to Hawai‘i and challenges specific to neighbor islands. Following these, a set of questions was asked to elicit information on how human trafficking issues have changed over the years: 1) “In your experience, what has changed about how people address human trafficking issues since the time you began working in this area?” 2) “Has anything changed that makes your work easier/better?” 3) “Harder/worse?” If participants did not spontaneously
discuss state legislative policies during this part of the interview, follow-up probes were used to illicit their knowledge or opinions of these changes, if appropriate. Two additional questions were used to prompt discussion around participants’ ideas for both helping victims and preventing human trafficking: “In your opinion, what is the best way to help those who have been trafficked in Hawai‘i?” and “In your opinion, what is the best way to prevent human trafficking in Hawai‘i?” Finally, two general questions were used to elicit any further thoughts they had on the topic of human trafficking: “What would you change, if anything, about anti-human trafficking efforts in Hawai‘i?” and “Is there any question about human trafficking or your work that I should have asked?”

By eliciting participant thoughts on their experiences of working on human trafficking and on developments or changes over the course of their work, collectively these questions were designed to provide a starting point for participants to begin discussing their views of human trafficking in Hawai‘i. Where necessary and appropriate, follow-up and probing questions were used to encourage participants to share more detail around specific points of interest. For example, several participants spontaneously mentioned Hawai‘i’s Plantation Era history during some point in the interview. When this happened, I asked additional questions to prompt the participant to reveal more about how they relate ideas of human trafficking to Plantation Era migrant labor.

**Procedures**

Participants were recruited primarily using snowball sampling. Most of the participants on O‘ahu were known to the researcher through interactions with the Hawai‘i Anti-Human Trafficking Coalition. Several coalition members with a variety of
experience with human trafficking (both sex and labor) were approached via either email or phone and asked to participate in the study. Additionally, several members of that coalition with whom the researcher had good rapport and repeated contact were asked to recommend service providers on Maui and the Big Island who might have experience with human trafficking.

Recruiting participants on the neighbor islands proved to be the most difficult part of the process. The O'ahu coalition members who were approached for recommendations of neighbor island stakeholders all discussed some variation of the idea that since there were relatively few cases on those islands, they were typically referred to O'ahu service providers for help. Therefore, O'ahu coalition members were only able to refer two stakeholders on neighbor islands. Additionally, stakeholders who had experience in areas with potential cross-over to human trafficking were located via internet searches and approached via email or phone. Whenever contact was made with a new potential participant on Maui or Hawai’i Island, the stakeholder was asked to recommend additional people or agencies that might have experience in human trafficking. Each of these recommendations was followed up with phone calls or emails until I received a sufficient number of stakeholders interested in participating in an interview.

Further, an effort was made to recruit participants with similar job positions on each island. If a contact from Maui, for example, agreed to participate in the study, then attempts were made to find a parallel contact (usually via internet search of contact information) on the Big Island or O’ahu. However, this approach had limited success because several of these potential participants did not respond to researcher efforts to contact them. Contacting potential participants by phone was preferred; emails were
used either as a primary introduction before a phone call or if no phone number was available. After 3–4 unreturned phone messages or emails, efforts to contact these potential participants were discontinued. In lieu of finding exact parallel matches between islands, participant recruitment was balanced with regards to having experience in either sex or labor trafficking.

After recruiting participants, explaining the purpose of the study and obtaining verbal consent to participate, I met with participants at the place and time of their choosing. When meeting with participants in person I went over the study in more detail and completed a written consent form with each participant (see Appendix B for the consent form). As part of the consent process, I asked each participant how they would be comfortable being identified in the research. Because Hawai‘i is a small island community, labeling interviews with a participant’s position and the island on which they work could result in default identification. Each participant gave a position they were comfortable using as a label (e.g., “immigration attorney”) and gave me permission to identify the island on which they were located. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Both the audio and text files from these interviews are stored on a password protected computer with no identifying information connecting the audio file with the participant. Participants were not asked about specific human trafficking cases in order to minimize potential risks to their clients. The information participants provided was kept confidential. Interview data was analyzed and reported in such a way as to insure that only the general labels determined by participants were used.

**Critical discourse procedures.** To examine how human trafficking is discussed in Hawai‘i, I used critical discourse methodology. As mentioned in the Literature Review section, critical discourse analysis attempts to systematically examine how
meaning is constructed in a text. In this case, I examined how human trafficking was constructed in interviews with stakeholders in Hawai‘i. The particular CDA methodology selected draws mainly from the process outlined in the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009) to CDA, but also pulls selectively from concepts related to Dispositive Analysis as described by Jager and Maier (2009). The particular conceptual contribution of Dispositive Analysis (discourse strands, discursive knots, and discursive events) will be discussed in more detail below. Both methods are largely based in the theoretical position outlined by Foucault (1971) in his *The Archeology of Knowledge*. The methods used in this study roughly followed the 8 step process of DHA outlined by Reisigl and Wodak (2009):

1) Review of the relevant and important literature on the selected topic  
2) Data collection  
3) Data sorting, selection and preparation  
4) Design of precise and specific research questions  
5) Preliminary analysis  
6) Detailed case study analysis  
7) Interpretation and critique  
8) Application of results (paraphrased, p. 96)

Step one and two of this process as it related to this study are outlined in the Literature Review and Method sections above. For this study, the data consists primarily of the participant interviews which were prepared for analysis by transcribing the audio recorded interviews verbatim. This process was accomplished in three stages. First, the interviews were transcribed by either the primary researcher or an undergraduate student assistant. Then these transcriptions were checked against the original audio recording by a second and different student researcher, and corrected where necessary. If discrepancies arose regarding how to transcribe a passage due to poor audio quality or mumbling, the discrepancies were marked. The primary investigator did a third and final check of each transcript using the audio recordings to
check for accuracy and making final decisions over how to resolve discrepancies.

Because of the large quantity of text in each interview and because some sections of the
interviews were less relevant or useful to an analysis of human trafficking discourse
than others, pertinent sections in each interview were then identified for detailed
analysis.

After the initial stages of reviewing the literature, collecting the data, and
preparing the data, following step 4 of the DHA process, precise and specific research
questions were formulated. These questions are listed in the Present Study section and
will be revisited in more detail in relation to specific data analysis techniques below.

Step 5 recommends a primary or pilot analysis of a segment of the data. This stage was
conducted as part of the final paper for a graduate course in Critical Discourse Analysis
methodology with the supervision and help of a political scientist experienced in these
methods (see Steger, 2008, for his contribution to CDA methodology). One interview
was analyzed in this pilot stage, which allowed for testing and modifying of the final
approach to data analysis. The detailed case study (step 6) of human trafficking
discourse among a sample of service providers in Hawai‘i reflects the major stage of data
analysis and is presented in the Results I section. A complete description of the
methodology used in this stage is presented below. The final DHA steps, the
interpretation and critique and the application of results, are reflected primarily in the
final discussion of the study.

**Analytical Methods**

As discussed above, during the detailed case study phase of the research, the full
set of relevant verbatim interview excerpts were analyzed using critical discourse
methods, particularly drawing from the Dispositive Analysis (DA) (Jager & Maier,
2009) and the Discourse-Historical (DHA) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009) Approaches. The Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) to critical discourse analysis stresses the importance of understanding and analyzing the context of a text. Reisigl & Wodak (2009) see context as mainly historical and orient themselves to this context on four levels: 1) text-internal context; 2) intertextual and interdiscursive context; 3) social and institutional norms related to the “context of the situation”; and 4) the larger sociopolitical and historical context (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p.93, paraphrased). The multiple stages of this study were oriented to these four levels of context to different degrees at different stages, but each should be acknowledged.

A focus on text-internal context (Level 1 context) uses the different concepts, topics, and arguments that lay within a text to mutually inform each other. This level of context was a major focus of the analysis stage of the study. Rather than assume a priori meanings for terms and labels, the text-internal context of the interviews were used to determine how these terms and labels were characterized. For instance, a detailed accounting was made of how each participant used the term “victim” so as to understand how that participant understood the meaning and category of victim.

A focus on intertextual context (Level 2 context) acknowledges the fact that written and spoken texts draw explicitly and implicitly from other texts weaving a web of intertextual relations. The importance of this level of context has already been discussed above in terms of Fairclough's (2003) suggestion that any study of discourse should begin with attempt to get “some rough idea” of the body of texts upon which the object of research might draw. Therefore, a rough outline of the potential intertextual contexts from which participants might draw was laid out in the Literature Review section.
A focus on interdiscursive (also Level 2) context refers to the idea that discourses on particular topics (such as human trafficking) draw from and mix with discourses on other topics (such as a discourse on immigration or on gender). This level of context is of particular interest to this study as it provides insight into how participants discursively construct the phenomenon of human trafficking. Thus, each construction of trafficking can be seen as a unique blend of discourses on immigration, sex, labor, etc. The interdiscursive context of the participant interviews was the focus of the first stage of analysis and will be discussed in more detail below.

The social and institutional norms related to the “context of the situation” (Level 3 context) in this study include norms related to conducting interviews. These include norms of taking turns in speaking where an interviewer asks questions and the participant answers them. This situational context of the interview and the associated norms are common in modern societies in the form of television interviews, job interviews, and documentary-style shows and movies. Therefore, the act of participating in a research interview carries certain social rules and norms with which participants are familiar and these will shape whatever text is produced. This level of context was not an explicit focus of this study but should be acknowledged as playing an important role in shaping the texts which were analyzed.

Finally, DHA methodology is focused on examining the historical and sociopolitical context (Level 4 context) of the text. A brief overview of the national and local historical and political context in which human trafficking discourses are situated can be found in the Literature Review section. I will return to focus on the historical and sociopolitical context of these local discourses on human trafficking throughout the analysis and in the Discussion Section.
Three stages of CDA analysis. An analysis of each relevant interview segment from each participant interview was conducted in three major stages. As discussed above, these stages of analysis were focused mainly on the first two levels of context: text-internal context and interdiscursive context. The first stage of analysis used concepts borrowed from Dispositive Analysis (DA) (Jager & Maier, 2009) to explore the interdiscursive (Level 2) context of the interviews. Because the term “discourse” is often used to refer to several different levels of semiotic action, DA theory distinguishes discourse around a particular topic from the abstract level of discourse (“statements” in the Foucaudian sense) by labeling a specific topic-focused discourse as a discourse strand.

Therefore, we can begin to talk about the discourse strand of human trafficking and how it is related to other discourse strands, such as a labor strand, an immigration strand, etc. This conceptualization of interdiscursivity is particularly useful for analyzing human trafficking, as any one construction of trafficking (such as that of the anti-prostitution movement) can be thought of as an amalgam of discourse strands arranged in a particular constellation. The DA approach also uses the concept of a discursive knot to talk about entwined or intermingling discourse strands. Each text examined likely includes discourse fragments from multiple different topics. These various topical discourse fragments can be tangled to varying degrees. When this happens they create what are known in the DA methodology as discursive knots. Using the DA concepts of discourse strands and discursive knots to answer research question 1a (What other discourse strands intersect with or are entangled in the discourse strand of human trafficking?), relevant interview segments were analyzed to methodically map
the overlap of discourse strands within the interviews, thus providing a thorough accounting of the interdiscursive context of analysis.

The second stage of analysis used concepts pulled from the Discourse-Historical Approach to examine the text-internal level of context (Level 1). DHA examines the discursive strategies used to create meaning within a text. Reisigl & Wodak (2009) describe these as follows: “By ‘strategy’, we generally mean a more or less intentional plan of practices (including discursive practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic goal.” They list 5 major discursive strategies: nomination, predication, argumentation, perpectivization, and intensification/mitigation.

For the purposes of this study, I draw only on the concepts of nomination and predication in order to answer research questions 1b (What social actors are mentioned in the participants’ discourse on human trafficking and how are they constructed?) and 2 (Is human trafficking seen as contextualized in a continuum of systemic abuses or as isolated incidences of aberrant behavior?). The strategy of nomination consists of linguistically naming or labeling social actors, phenomena, events and processes; the related strategy of predication qualifies these social actors, phenomena, events and processes with connotations and attributions that range from positive to negative (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Conducting a detailed analysis of the nomination and predication strategies used to construct social actors (research question 1b) and phenomena (research question 2) related to human trafficking helps bring clarity to the scope and limitations of these constructions.

Thus, Stage 2 of the analysis consisted of detailing the nomination and predication strategies used to construct phenomena and processes related to human
trafficking. These included the phenomenon of trafficking itself, but also phenomena that are related to human trafficking, such as prostitution, immigration, and migrant labor. Analyzing the range of phenomena that participants discussed in relation to human trafficking can provide a picture of how these phenomena are constructed as related or not to practices of human trafficking. Examining this can provide insight into whether and how human trafficking is situated within a systemic context of other phenomena.

Using the same concepts of nomination and predication that were analyzed in Stage 2, the final stage of CDA analysis detailed these same strategies, but with regard to social actors rather than phenomena. Stage 3 focused on social actors in order to understand how participants constructed important groups of people involved in the process of human trafficking (i.e., “victims”, “traffickers”, etc). Participant constructions of victims and perpetrators are of particular interest for the purposes of understanding how human trafficking is discursively constructed on the local level. Understanding the qualities ascribed to these two groups and who “counts” as a victim or a perpetrator of human trafficking can provide important information with regards to the construction of the phenomenon.

Taken together these three stages of analysis answer the two major research questions:

1) How do the participants construct human trafficking discursively?
   a. What other discourse strands (immigration, women, labor etc) intersect with or are entangled in the discourse strand of human trafficking?
   b. What social actors are mentioned in the participants’ discourse on human trafficking and how are they constructed?
2) Is human trafficking seen as contextualized in a continuum of systemic abuses or as isolated incidences of aberrant behavior?

The remaining research questions relate to the interpretation, critique, and application of the findings and will be addressed in the Discussion section:

2a. What are the power implications of contextualizing or decontextualizing human trafficking from a continuum of abuses?

2b. What model of human trafficking might be constructed to allow for concrete investigation of human trafficking along a continuum of abuses?

Supplemental Information

Much like the traditional qualitative research methods used in social science research, the Discourse-Historical Approach uses the concept of triangulation to provide depth and dimensionality to research findings. In recognition of the complexity of the objects of study (such as the object of human trafficking), Reisigl and Wodack (2009) recommend that researchers consider and triangulate many different sources of data using diverse analytical perspectives.

Therefore, in addition to conducting a CDA analysis on the interviews, I also examined each interview using traditional (phenomenological) qualitative analysis techniques (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and conducted a content review of local newspaper articles that discuss human trafficking. For the phenomenological stage of analysis, NVivo software was used to categorize themes and subthemes in order to provide a more traditional overview of the topics covered and information offered by the participants. The final results of this analysis will be presented to participants. For the purpose of providing triangulation for this study, only a segment of these findings will be discussed. As the major focus of the CDA analysis presented in this study centered
on issues related to how human trafficking is discursively constructed, rather than on the actual content provided by participants, this supplemental analysis focused on whether the participants themselves perceived issues related to how human trafficking is defined and operationalized in Hawai‘i. To do this analysis focused on two main questions:

1) Do the participants discuss challenges related to the definition of human trafficking?
   a. How do the participants characterize these challenges?

2) Do the participants bring up issues related to power when discussing how human trafficking is addressed in the islands?

The information obtained in this analysis will provide another layer of text-internal context that can be used to inform final conclusions regarding the main CDA analysis of the interviews. Specifically, it will provide information on whether or not participants themselves identify and acknowledge discursive challenges (i.e. definitional and power issues) with respect to their attempts to address human trafficking in Hawai‘i. While CDA allows for the examination of discourse that can reflect more or less conscious views of a topic, this additional analysis provides information about whether participants consciously and explicitly face challenges related to the variety of ways human trafficking can be constructed. Further, participant observations about issues related to power and how these impact human trafficking efforts can provide important information about what local power interests might be shaping the discourse on human trafficking.

A second supplemental analysis consisted of a systematic survey of local newspaper coverage of human trafficking in Hawai‘i. The discourses presented in these
media reports are likely to be influential in shaping the way local stakeholders view human trafficking. As such, they add to the body of texts presented above in the literature review as potential webs of discourse from which participants may draw in their own descriptions of human trafficking. This snapshot of local context adds an element of triangulation to the primary focus of this study, the critical discourse analysis. This supplemental analysis quantified the number, type and frequency of articles over the last 12 years in four major local newspapers (The Honolulu Star Advertiser, The Honolulu Star Bulletin, The Honolulu Advertiser, and the online Honolulu Civil Beat news blog). The guiding questions in this stage of analysis were:

1) When human trafficking is discussed in local newspaper articles, what subtypes (labor or sex) are covered and with what frequency?

2) Roughly which terms are most frequently used when these articles discuss human trafficking (sex trafficking, labor trafficking, slavery, forced labor, or prostitution)?

3) Can important local discursive events be identified by the frequency with which they are covered in the local newspaper articles?

Jager & Maier (2009) define discursive events as those that appear “on the discourse planes of politics and the media, intensively and for a prolonged period of time.” In Hawai‘i there are a few events that might rise to the level of a discursive event, which would indicate that they likely played some role in shaping local discourses on human trafficking. Potential discursive events in Hawai‘i may include local human trafficking cases and the passage of and debates over state-level human trafficking legislation. To identify these discursive events, the local newspaper articles were systematically
catalogued with regard to number of newspaper articles mentioning either a specific case or specific State legislation.

**Validity of Findings**

This study does not fit within the traditional rubric of social scientific research in which one must show the validity and reliability of findings. Because discourse analysis necessarily deals in the world of words, ideas, and meanings, it is not appropriate to use either of these concepts when talking about critical discourse findings. Fairclough (2003), places critical discourse analysis within the tradition of “critical social science”, which he defines as, “social science which is motivated by the aim of providing a scientific basis for a critical questioning of social life in moral and political terms (p. 14).” He argues that often when social scientists attempt to analyze aspects of social life without focusing on these “moral and political” aspects, they inadvertently act to perpetuate and legitimate existing social structures, and that “neither approach is ‘objective’ in a simple sense, both approaches are based in particular interests and perspectives (p. 15).” This view has been apparent in the social science produced to date on human trafficking. Far from “objective,” the studies outlined above often have unacknowledged political and moral facets.

Fairclough (2003) also talks about typical social science and how it usually serves to “make existing forms of social life work more efficiently and effectively without considering moral or political questions at all.” For these reasons, critical discourse analysis is necessarily a pursuit of knowledge about a reality “which is contingent, shifting, and partial”. This does not mean that the method and approach are not rigorous and cannot represent some aspects of the reality of human trafficking in Hawai‘i. The strength of this particular method for this particular topic is that it seeks
to explicitly analyze the political and moral implications of different conceptualizations of human trafficking rather than attempt to analyze trafficking as an objective reality.

As discussed above, the goal of critical discourse analysis in this case is not to present an “objective” view of human trafficking, but to examine whether particular constructions of human trafficking are just. Thus the method is evaluative and based on some “fundamental norms” (van Dijk, 2009). For this reason, rather than discuss validity and reliability it is more useful to present a transparent account of the “fundamental norms” to be used in the critique of discourses.

Community psychology as a discipline recognizes that psychological research that attempts to be value-free often harbors subtle or unacknowledged values. Therefore, community psychologists have come up with core values by which researchers and practitioners orient and direct their work (Kloos et al., 2011). One of these values, social justice, will be the primary norm which will guide evaluative assessments of human trafficking discourse in this study. Kloos et al. (2011) define social justice as “the fair, equitable allocation of resources, opportunities, obligations and power in society as a whole” (p.29). Based on this definition, evaluations of discourses using this value as a guide would look at whether and how discursive constructions of human trafficking perpetuate unfair distributions of power, opportunities, and resources.

In analyzing the core values of the Global Justice Movement, Steger and Wilson (2013) found that social justice is also a central value to this movement and describes its definition in that context as follows:

For these GJM organizations, power is about having the ability to make decisions about your own life, the resources you have, your environment, working conditions and so on. At present, such power is seen as located in the hands of a powerful few who impose their decisions on the many, top-down (p. 37).
The focus within this definition of social justice on power and the ability to make decisions about your own life fits well with the critical discourse analysis focus on understanding how power is maintained and reproduced through discourse. Therefore, the guiding value throughout the analysis was uncovering where these unequal distributions of power were being maintained.

Based on the observations of others as described in the literature reviewed above, one way that unequal power distributions are maintained in discourses about trafficking is through severing human trafficking from the context of the continuum of abuses in which it exists (Brennan, 2010; Chacón, 2006). This allows for action against these “severe” forms of abuse without necessitating that any kind of action be taken towards addressing the systemic contexts which produce these abuses and maintain unequal distributions of power. Discourses that sever human trafficking from these contexts allow for lesser “ordinary” abuses to thrive unacknowledged. Therefore, an exploration of this particular type of discursive “work” of dissociating human trafficking from its context was an explicit focus of the research.

No doubt there are many ways one might explore issues of social justice within human trafficking discourses beyond considering these contextual issues. Other researchers with different guiding values would likely produce different results. In transparently communicating my “fundamental norms”, I hope that readers will have the tools necessary to evaluate the quality and appropriateness of the findings within that context.
Chapter 4. Results I (CDA Analysis)

Stage 1: Discourse Strands and Knots

The first step in data analysis was the systematic charting of the themes and discourse strands present in each relevant interview segment. For each interview a chart was created with the text from the relevant interview segments in a column to the far left of the page. In the center column the theme of each participant comment was recorded next to the passage it summarized. Finally, in a third column a list of the discourse strands present in each passage were recorded. An example of the kind of chart that resulted from this analysis can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Example of Discourse Strand Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER:</th>
<th>Q: In your opinion what is the best way to prevent human trafficking on Maui?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, what’s the best way to prevent human trafficking on Maui?</td>
<td>I think preventing HT is similar to preventing all forms of violence against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT:</td>
<td>So increasing self-esteem and self-awareness of the young girls in our community. Um, you know having a bit more strong knowledge of who they are. Awareness, talking to them about, you know, how you might get approached. And, um, kinda like I was saying, you know, it’s hard—when you’re 13 years old and you come from this dysfunctional family and your parents are all loaded and drunk or whatever, abusive, and then you go to school and your friend’s got this fabulous designer bag, cell phone, money, drugs, and it’s just gonna be a blow job. Um (elongated um, not thinking um), it’s hard to tell them not to go for that. But I think if we can talk to them about that and to prepare them for that and have a conversation, that might be really, really helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wow. So, I think it’s real similar to how to prevent all forms of violence against women. So, like, increasing self-esteem and self-awareness of the young girls in our community. Um, you know having a bit more strong knowledge of who they are. Awareness, talking to them about, you know, how you might get approached. And, um, kinda like I was saying, you know, it’s hard—when you’re 13 years old and you come from this dysfunctional family and your parents are all loaded and drunk or whatever, abusive, and then you go to school and your friend’s got this fabulous designer bag, cell phone, money, drugs, and it’s just gonna be a blow job. Um (elongated um, not thinking um), it’s hard to tell them not to go for that. But I think if we can talk to them about that and to prepare them for that and have a conversation, that might be really, really helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER:</td>
<td>Q: So some kind of education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um-hum. So kind of some education?</td>
<td>I would love to package it under both human trafficking and domestic violence prevention. You know, I’m tired of sexual violence prevention. That—we’re talking to the wrong people when we’re talking to girls about preventing child sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT:</td>
<td>Q: So some kind of education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah. And I would love it to be packaged under, not just human trafficking prevention, but domestic violence prevention. You know, I’m tired of sexual violence prevention. That—we’re talking to the wrong people when we’re talking to girls about preventing child sex</td>
<td>I would love to package it under both human trafficking and domestic violence prevention. You know, I’m tired of sexual violence prevention. That—we’re talking to the wrong people when we’re talking to girls about preventing child sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Example of Discourse Strand Analysis
abuse, but ’cause they can’t prevent- I’m sick of that whole conversation. We need to be talking to rapists about that, and potential rapists about not being a rapist. But, you know, about teaching girls how to be confident and sure of themselves and, ’cause you know it’s so hard. I-I-I would like, um, when I watch my nieces and stuff, I thought it’s- it’s really hard to- to be strong in who we are. And that people look different. We need to tell girls it’s okay to look different. To have curly hair, or to, you know what I mean? To not have perfect teeth or-

They can’t prevent it, we are talking to the wrong people
We need to be talking to the rapists and potential rapists about not being a rapist
But we can teach girls how to be confident and sure of themselves
It is so hard for young girls to be strong in who they are
People look different, we need to tell girls that it is okay to look different

Sex, violence, children
Children, gender, HT prevention
Children, gender, HT prevention
Children, gender, HT prevention

After systematically charting the themes and discourse strands present in each relevant passage of each interview, six major discourse strands were identified as important to constituting and modifying discourses on human trafficking. That is, these discourse strands tended to be combined in different ways, depending on the participant, to produce different discourses on human trafficking. These major discourse strands centered on the following topics: immigration, labor, sex, gender, children, and consent. First, a brief overview of each of the major strands will be presented and illustrated with relevant textual passages from the various interviews. Then the major discursive knots that constitute human trafficking will be outlined and illustrated before discussing some of the variation in the way the knots were patterned in the different interviews.

**Six major discourse strands**

**Immigration:** Topics in the discourse strand of immigration included discussions of the national immigration debate, immigration relief (including the process of applying for trafficking visas), fears/issues around immigration status, and cultural issues related to immigrant groups. The two passages below illustrate examples of the immigration discourse strand. While both included topics related to the “immigration debate” they represented two different political stances in relation to how immigration issues interact with human trafficking.
And then, you know, sometimes when I do public outreach there's always the person who raises their hand [and] says, “Well, what part about illegal do they not understand?” And so whenever there's that kind of climate, it's going to make talking about or visibility for some of the more subtle or complex or nuanced issues a little more difficult because it's hard in a climate like this to talk about trafficking or victims of domestic violence who are immigrant women when most people don't even understand the difference between calling somebody undocumented versus illegal, stuff like that (Participant 0048).

And they may have had motivations to go- if they were immigrant victims- become legal. Their families would be brought to the front of the line. And so, you know, that always kind of bothered me… So it's, you know, it goes back to that big immigration debate. So when somebody's not legal, do you allow them to become legal because they exercised some illegality to start with? And somebody else at the back of the train here can't even get moving forward because all of these having in the front. And it's just a fairness (Participant 0046).

These two separate views related to the “immigration debate” illustrate a point worth noting about the various discourse strands identified in the interviews. Within each discourse strand there can be various different views of the topic addressed in that strand. Discourse strands highlight the topic, but within the topic there are often multiple discourses that compete for dominance. In this case, the discourse strand is that of immigration, but there are different and opposing views toward immigration within that strand. In the passages above, the first represents a discourse on immigration that is critical of a simplistic understanding of “illegal” immigrants. By contrast, the second passage represents a discourse that emphasizes “fairness” and is critical of any “illegality” that might taint an immigrant’s strategies of migration. Each of these competing discourses on immigration will be taken up in more detail below.

**Labor.** Topics in the discourse strand of labor included issues of labor abuse and discrimination, fair wages, and finding employment. Discussions of labor in the study interviews rarely occurred outside of the context of immigration. This relationship (one of the primary discursive knots) will be discussed in more detail below. The following passage illustrates one representation of the labor strand of discourse.
And if you’re going to bring ‘em in to work, are you going to pay ‘em the proper wage? And the thing is, if paying the proper wage your carrots and your potatoes and whatever else you’re gonna grow are not gonna be the same price you see at the markets. It will be different. They’ll be higher. So are you willing to pay that— are we as a society willing to pay that price so we can pay these people a prevailing wage? And whether or not farmers are willing to do so, because this has been, not been a one shot thing. It’s been going on for decades I think (Participant 0053).

**Sex:** Discourses on sex included primarily discussions about prostitution, the sex industry, and sex trafficking. As such, these discourses represented only one element in a larger discourse strand on sex. Other aspects to the discourse strand of sex that were not mentioned in the interviews might include sex between intimate partners, sexual norms, monogamy, etc. in short, the various meanings that can be attached to different sexual encounters. By contrast, in this study, the interview participants tended to primarily discuss sex as a financial transaction (forced or otherwise), rather than sex in general. That said, the various constructions of the act of having sex in exchange for money are tied up with larger culturally and historically-bound constructions of sex and what it means. The constructions of prostitution and the sex industry belong to this larger discourse strand on sex. Therefore, rather than calling this a discourse strand on prostitution, in recognition of the fact that discourses on prostitution are tied up in other cultural discourses that surround sexual practices and their meanings, I have labeled this a discourse strand on sex. Because views of what is and is not appropriate when it comes to sex acts are largely dictated by cultural values, they are often unnoticed and unquestioned. These kinds of discourses that operate in the background of our views of the world tend to be very powerful because they are unexamined and taken for granted. An example of this strand is shown below with one participant’s discussion of sex tourism.

*And also to make sure that, you know, visitors that come to Hawai‘i, since Hawai‘i is such a destination place, know first and foremost that it’s not okay to come here for sex tourism. Like, it’s not— Hawai‘i is not gonna be known for that, and, you know, like, “not in our land!” It’s just*
not something that we want people to think of, like, their vacation and associate that with easy access to paid sex or whatever (Participant 0052).

**Gender:** Another major strand included discourses on gender. Like the sex discourse strand, this strand tended to be more implicit than explicit, though occasionally participants made direct mention to the women’s movement and the way women are viewed in society. I have called this the gender discourse strand rather than a discourse strand on women because in a few instances representations of men were also important to understanding human trafficking. In fact, in the first passage below the participant discusses how the idea that victims of human trafficking can be male was surprising to some. Not only does this have implications for a discourse on men, but it also has implications for a discourse on women. The underlying assumption that was contradicted by the idea that men can be victims of human trafficking is that it is more acceptable or expected that victims are women. The binary way in which men and women are often discussed makes it more useful to analyze a discourse on gender as a whole rather than limit the analysis to a discourse on women. The passages below represent both this implicit representation of gender (0046) and an explicit discussion of the women’s movement (0047):

*So it’s a labor case. So it’s not always about women who are being- or children (emphasis) that are mistreated, kidnapped, abused. It could be men that are manipulated by emotional coercion which I- and some physical- but it was mostly emotional coercion. And I think that was very eye opening, too, that victims are not who you think they would be. You know, a 6’3”, 6 foot, 3 guy, brawny, he could just run away (Participant 0046).*

*You know, this year I have been confronted with this good-old-boys network in a bigger more- I feel like the work that the women’s movement has done over the years has sort of drew a tidal wave and the old-boys network is, now they’re just trying to thrash women (Participant 0047).*

**Children:** The focus of some participants’ discourses on minor sex trafficking implies unacknowledged assumptions about the nature of children and what constitutes a child. Therefore, I have also identified a discourse strand on children as one of the
major strands involved in constituting human trafficking. Like the discourse strands on sex and gender, the strand on children is largely implicit in the participants’ discussions of human trafficking. As with the discourse strand of sex, this discourse is highly impacted by Western cultural values and is very much a part of what Charles Taylor (2004) would call the “social imaginary” in the Western context. The social imaginary, as described by Taylor, is composed of those aspects of our social worlds that are assumed to be true, that are so much a part of our background understanding of the world that they remain unquestioned. While several scholars have written about the assumptions of gender and women that underlie much of the trafficking discourse (see Cheng, 2008; Sullivan, 2003), comparatively less has been written regarding the assumptions about children that underlie U.S. human trafficking policy. In the West, there are strong assumptions about maturity, age, and childhood that do not hold true across cultures, such as the age of 18 marking maturity. My intention is not to point out that these views are wrong or invalid, only that they are values that belong to a particular cultural and historical context. It is important to examine these discourses on children, sex, and gender in order to make explicit what is too often unexamined and taken for granted. This can help us understand the role these discourses play in constructing human trafficking.

In the study interviews, discourses on children rarely occur outside the context of discourses on sex. This major discursive knot will be discussed in more detail below. To illustrate this strand both inside of and outside of the context of the sex discourse strand I include two passages below. The first shows a discourse on children outside of the sex strand and illustrates how it can interact with the immigration and labor strands to provide explanatory motivation for workers tolerating poor conditions. The
second illustrates how implied discourses on children (in this case, teens) combines with the discourse strand of sex.

Right. I mean, I think- but then, they’re like any other parents. They bring their wives over. They hope better for their kids. [INTERVIEWER: Yeah, so they’ll put up with whatever so their kids can have it better?] Right (Participant 0053).

“Well, I got it from so-and-so and you can get it too. We just have to give blow jobs. It’s really not sex, you know? And they give you nice clothes, I mean, ‘cause you gotta go into these nice hotels and…” So these girls see it as status and then they also don’t see it as sex. So they love the money. They love the drugs. They love the I-phones and the expensive purses and stuff.” So that’s (emphasis) the newest twist on human trafficking and we’re not seeing them in our programs (Participant 0047).

**Consent:** The discourse strand of consent is included as a major strand because of its presence in a large portion of the interviews and because it often plays a central role in discussions of what “counts” as human trafficking. Discourses on consent include discussions about the voluntary nature of activities, agreements or contracts, and how trafficking victims have been reported to view their own circumstances. Discourses on consent can be used to either shrink or expand the concept of human trafficking. Below is an example from the participant interviews illustrating each of these effects. In the first example the participant draws a distinction between the experiences of plantation era migrant workers and modern human trafficking by employing a discourse on consent. In the second example, the participant employs a discourse on consent in relation to prostitution.

*Because immigration has always been a way for people to do better than the country that you came from. So it’s an economic decision. Not because they’re forced into. It’s not like the, you know, slaves from Africa were brought some place else. And it was- that was an economic decision too- but here [Plantation Era migration for work] it was voluntary in servitude for periods of time (Participant 0046).*

*Or making the connection that prostitution isn’t just women who are choosing to do it but that there’s some sort of victimization going on there. That’s still, I think a level of education that needs to continue to take place and to transform our society eyes, in terms of how to view, you know, girls who are on Kuhio Avenue. And it’s not like completely that they’re there just by, you know, their ideal job or dream job (Participant 0052).*
In fact, discourses on consent are often quite pivotal to how human trafficking is constructed. Because of this they will be discussed in much more detail below.

It is clear from some of the passages provided above that these six major discourse strands often overlap and are tangled up with each other and with the strand of human trafficking. Passages in which two or more strands are tangled represent discursive knots and are particularly useful to understanding how human trafficking is constructed. For instance, not all migrant labor results in human trafficking. Examining the ways in which the immigration, labor, consent, and human trafficking strands combine and are tangled in a discursive knot can shed some light on how migrant labor is related to human trafficking in a particular text.

**Two major discursive knots.** The results of this analysis showed that the six primary strands were combined with the strand of human trafficking in different ways by different participants, indicating some variation in the way human trafficking is constructed. However, a general pattern to the overall combination of strands did emerge. This pattern resulted in two relatively separate discursive knots that mutually constitute human trafficking. The first major discursive knot is a tangle of the labor, immigration, and human trafficking strands. The second is a tangle of some combination (depending on the participant) of the sex, children, gender, and human trafficking strands. The consent strand was employed differently by different participants, sometimes in the context of the Labor/Immigration knot and sometimes in the context of the Sex/Children/Gender knot.

For each participant interview a pictorial representation of the main pattern of interaction between the six discourse strands was created. Two examples of these pictorial representations illustrating slightly different constructions of each of the two
major knots are shown below in Figures 1-4. The relative size and overlap of the different circles are meant to represent the importance and degree of entanglement of each of the discourse strands in a particular interview. These maps were created by reviewing the chart of systematically analyzed discourse strands for each interview, paying careful attention to how the different strands tended to be entangled and how prominent each strand appeared in the interview. This was an iterative process, whereby I would return multiple times to each discourse map after working through the others to ensure that each map was comparable. However, given that discourse analysis deals with abstract meaning, these maps should be thought of as impressionistic, rather than concrete, representations of the discourse strands and knots present in each interview.

**Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration.**

Figure 1. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0048)  
Figure 2. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0044)

The discursive knot of labor and immigration is tangled to a very high degree when in the context of human trafficking and constitutes most of the discourses around labor trafficking. As discussed briefly above, nearly all the instances in which the strands of human trafficking and labor were tangled also included the strand of immigration. As only a very small number of national labor trafficking cases have
included domestic victims, that discourses on labor and human trafficking largely occur in the context of the immigration discourse strand is not surprising.

Because the vast majority of participant discussion involving immigration also involved labor, this labor/immigration knot represents the major way human trafficking is entangled with immigration. However, immigration does combine with other discourse strands creating separate knots. While minor compared to the labor/immigration knot, these other immigration-related knots are not insignificant. Instances of immigration knots absent of labor included discussions of sex trafficking with immigrant women (an immigration/sex/gender knot), discussions of the general way in which immigrants are vulnerable to human trafficking (immigration/human trafficking), and discussions of domestic violence in the context of immigration (gender/immigration). Two examples of such instances can be seen below:

So historically that’s been the- that’s why the hostess bar, I call it, sort of the old school prostitution, human trafficking. Because they were trafficking women here from Asia, originally from Korea, but other Asian countries as well, you know? So…third world countries, you know; so, we’re really- so that’s been sort of a culture here (Participant 0047).

And then sometimes the perpetrators in cases of DV or where there’s trafficking are really smart at using the person’s status as a manipulator, to threaten or coerce or leverage them so they can say, you know, “If you tell anybody what’s going on or if you go to the police or if you even if you go to the county or to a private attorney for help with this, I will have you deported” (Participant 0048).

While it is clear that within the labor/immigration knot no participant equated all instances involving immigrant labor with human trafficking, the complexity of the boundary between non-trafficking immigrant labor and labor trafficking was sometimes muddled. Passages in which there are discursive knots consisting of the immigration, labor, and human trafficking discourse strands, therefore, are often sites where competing discourses struggle for dominance. One example of this can be seen below:
A lot of the things I hear about are just close to the edge of— you know, if you talk to the hotel, they probably don’t see that— their practices as being coercive or involuntary. But for the person whose going through it, to them it is a little bit coercive and involuntarily. Like, they may have the understanding that their status here is dependent on that job and that they don’t really have any choice but to work there or they can get in trouble if they quit or they’ll have to go back if they quit or something like that and they don’t have the money to go back. And then holding the passports, you know, seems like a small thing but that makes a person unable to leave or to do anything (Participant 0048).

In this example the participant is discussing the boundary between human trafficking and non-trafficking employment of immigrants. He presents two competing viewpoints: that of the workers and that of the employers. These viewpoints can be seen as a struggle to claim the truth of the situation: is it coercive or not? Here the discourse strand of consent is also an important part of this discursive knot, as workers may not feel they have a choice in their work. This lack of choice can limit meaningful consent, a theme that recurs throughout the interviews. Interactions of each major discursive knot with the discourse strand on consent often represent important points of struggle between competing interests and discourses and will be discussed in more detail below. For now, the important point is that these knots represent cites of discursive struggle. Understanding this struggle is essential to understanding discourses on human trafficking.

It is notable that the discourse strands of labor and sex are rarely if ever tangled in any way. This runs starkly contrary to much of the literature debating sex trafficking and prostitution in which some academics construct work in the sex industry as a kind of labor that could be regulated so as to better protect sex workers (e.g., see Sullivan, 2003). That kind of labor-related construction of sex trafficking was noticeably absent in this set of interviews. The stark separation between the sex and labor discourse strands reflects the general tendency to divide the phenomenon of human trafficking between sex trafficking and labor trafficking. Of the two, sex
trafficking seemed to be constructed more variably than labor trafficking. Labor trafficking was almost always constructed through a discursive knot of immigration, labor, and human trafficking. Some variation might be seen in the degree and way in which the consent discourse strand is deployed relative to the discursive knot of labor, immigration, and human trafficking and in the degree to which a discourse of gender interacts with the knot, but in general the labor and immigration strands were fairly consistently related to each other in each of the interviews.

Discursive knot #2: sex, children and gender. The second discursive knot, depicted in Figures 3 and 4, is more variable than the first. Nearly every participant spoke at some point in the interview about the interlocking of the immigration, labor, and human trafficking strands. By contrast, the amount of overlap and entanglement between the four strands of sex, children, gender, and human trafficking varied greatly. Two participants made no mention of a discourse on sex, and even among those who spoke primarily about sex trafficking, the children and/or gender strands were employed to varying degrees. In addition, a few participants also tended to emphasize the immigration strand in relation to the Sex/Gender knot, representing another variation in the construction of that knot. Each of these variations in the relative importance of the children, gender, or immigration strands within a sex and human trafficking knot will be illustrated and discussed below.
In some passages participants stressed the role of gender in prostitution and sex trafficking, signifying a primary knot between the strands of Sex/Gender/Human Trafficking. The following passage illustrates this by discussing a view of human trafficking whereby a particular perception of women produces a high demand for sex trafficking. This tightly links discourses on women to sex and human trafficking.

The sex trafficking side, now that’s another thing, push and pull. You have the demand. I mean, and then you have, the demand is high. I mean that has something to do with our own sense of integrity, of respect for women, you know? I’m saying in sex side, yeah? What makes women—how we perceive that integrity of the human being and instead of just using them like property. That’s a whole— that’s a brainset thing (Participant 0058).

As discussed above, often discourses on women have reciprocal implications for discourses on men. The dual, men/women, nature of the discourse strand of gender as it relates to sex and human trafficking is illustrated in the following passage. The participant was discussing the idea that each person can do something to address human trafficking.

Um, maybe what they can do to make a difference is starting a conversation with men about how women are treated and the sexualization of young girls and women. And, um, it could be a conversation about sexual addictions that our country struggles with, those kinds of things (Participant 0054).
Thus, a discursive knot that represents an entanglement of discourses on sex, gender, and human trafficking tends to portray women as victims. This interpretation lends itself to a portrayal of men as perpetrators. The implication of this passage is that in order to stop sex trafficking, we need to talk to men about sex and about how they view women.

While the two previous passages expressed the idea that human trafficking can be prevented through changing society's view of women, other passages, indicated that the source of the sex trafficking problem has to do primarily with the vulnerability of children (a knot of Sex/Children/Human Trafficking strands).

And many times it’s because they’re [kids] running from something that they don’t want to be involved with their family, unless running to someone. So maybe away from something, to something, then the ‘to something’ becomes something that they don’t want (emphasis) and then they get stuck in it. And then how do you extricate them, how do you rescue them, how do you, you know rehab them (Participant 0046).

Prevent human trafficking, would be talking really plainly to children, girls and boys, at a young age. I’m talking like, starting at like 10 and 11 years old, which seems way too young, but the average age of entry into prostitution in the United States is between 13 and 14 years old (Participant 0054).

Both of these passages stress the vulnerability of children and imply that they can easily get caught up in human trafficking. Within a Sex/Children discursive knot, children become a primary focus of trafficking prevention strategies.

Other participants spoke of the importance of family and suggested that strengthening the family unit would help prevent human trafficking. This view is also indirectly a discourse on children, implying that unstable family situations make children vulnerable to human trafficking:

I mean, a piece that I kinda find with my sex trafficking victims is, like, it often begins, or like the vulnerability of the victim begins at home. And so anything that we can do to continue to strengthen families, um, and provide more support for our families, especially families that might be, um, more subject to, um, just whether it’s financial difficulties or, um, if they’re immigrants,
coming here and being, um, ostracized because they don’t necessarily fit in right away. Like, looking at those, um, those problems and trying to address it from the very beginning before it even gets to the point where the victim becomes vulnerable enough to leave the home and, you know, have to, um, feel like they need to go into the sex industry. So whatever can strength the family unit (Participant 0052).

This passage is significant in that it was one of the only passages that contained a discursive knot between the Sex/Children/Immigration. The participant seemed to imply that even immigrant children become vulnerable to human trafficking because of issues within the family. Interestingly, the idea that family issues may make children “leave the home” and “feel like they need to go into the sex industry” was typically used to discuss the domestic trafficking of U.S. citizens under the age of 18.

The third variation that was seen in discussing sex and human trafficking was a knot between the Sex/Immigration/Human Trafficking strands. However, unlike the passage just described above, which was unusual in that it linked the children, immigration, and sex strands, the knot between the Sex/Immigration strands tended to lean more towards including discourses on gender rather than discourses on children.

The following passage illustrates a more typical discussion of the immigration strand in relation to a Sex/Human Trafficking discursive knot:

So that's just a microcosm of this larger problem created by this 2-87 G where if- like, let’s say you were a prostitute and you're being forced to work in the sex industry because, you know, because somebody was telling you to do it, and you- but your fear is well founded that if you went to the police and they- or if you got arrested by the police- but even if you went to the police and they asked you, you know, “How do you?”, you know, “How do you know about this?” “Well because I've been being a prostitute because this person makes me.” Well, then you might get arrested. And as soon as you get finger printed even if you’re not the problem you- then you get hauled into the immigration dragnet and then deported (Participant 0048).

In this passage, the vulnerability of the victim to sex trafficking stems less from gender or age, than from immigration status. This passage also contains a discourse strand on consent, using the words “being forced” and being “made” to be a prostitute.
In general, participants would stress the gender, the children, or the immigration strands more or less in relation to the sex and human trafficking strands, depending on their experience and their interests. For example, those helping victims with immigration relief may, understandably, stress the immigration strand more than gender or children strands when discussing sex trafficking. These differential preferences led to the wider variation in the second major knot with regards to how human trafficking was constructed.

Domestic violence and human trafficking. An additional minor knot is worth mentioning as it was present in several participant interviews. This is the knot of the immigration and gender discourse strands, especially as it relates to domestic violence. The neighbor island participants had fewer direct experiences with human trafficking than O'ahu participants. However, many of them had encountered domestic violence in immigrant populations and drew parallels between the vulnerability of immigrant women to domestic violence and the vulnerability of immigrants in general to human trafficking.

*You know, and whether the people that I meet who have been victimized, so it’s- ‘cause many of them now come in as victims of DV. You know, and they’re the ones who- I mean I just got a call yesterday again where she was- you know, the husband is doing this, abusing her, da-da-da. Can’t come out of the camp. You know, she’s not supposed to come out. And, but she ran away to a friend’s house. Um, that now comes in the form of DV. Is it human trafficking? I don’t know. This is something I’m gonna ask, see if I can uncover anything. But there’s quite a bit of those, a lot of victims of DV where they are, you know, there’s signs of trafficking (Participant 0044).*

*I know there was a woman… who sought our services. And she had been brought over from the Philippines to work on either a macadamia nut or coffee farm. It’s like seasonal work. And she had, um, two children. And she was just provided a tent as living quarters. And paid very minimal. And was not allowed to leave the property, right? …And she thought that that’s basically what she had signed up for, right, for this duration of this time, right? This, the job is this. And it could be that she didn’t have any knowledge that she had rights kinda thing. And because of the language barrier, right, she was unable to ask the right questions to receive the answers she sought. Right, and it wasn’t until she had been abused, which- [INTERVIEWER: By her husband?] Yes. And that she- and that law enforcement got involved.*
In both of these situations potential human trafficking abuses (perpetrated by employers) may have co-occurred with domestic violence (perpetrated by the husband). In fact, an argument could be made that the secrecy and isolation of remote farms in rural areas, combined with the vulnerability of immigrants, are contributing factors to both human trafficking and domestic violence abuses in these situations. While not of primary concern to a study on human trafficking, the inclusion of this discursive knot between the Immigration and Gender strands within some of the interviews indicates a particular understanding of the vulnerability of immigrant women that has interesting parallels with human trafficking.

**Discourses on consent interact with both discursive knots.** The frequency and importance of the role of a discourse on consent in these participant interviews was initially an unexpected finding. Upon closer examination it became clear that competing discourses on consent, both in these interviews and in the literature on human trafficking, are central to constructing the phenomenon. Those who describe human trafficking as modern day slavery are using the idea of slavery to show that victims have been made to do something against their will, something to which they have not consented. This is a compelling and powerful construction of human trafficking that produces clear victims and perpetrators. However, consent in modern human trafficking is often complicated and much less clear than the impression of complete non-consent that is represented in the term “slavery.”

In the literature, discourses on the complicated nature of consent are used by anti-prostitution advocates to question the degree of consent involved in one’s participation in the sex industry. Likewise, those who advocate for anti-human trafficking policies with regards to immigrant workers also use a discourse on the
complicated nature of consent to protect these workers from situations to which they may have initially agreed. Competing narratives in both of these cases contribute to different discourses on consent. For example, some feminist writers argue that women in the sex industry often have more agency (i.e., purposeful consent to their situation) than the anti-prostitution groups give them credit. Advocates of strong and exclusionary immigration policies employ a discourse on consent that criticizes irregular migration strategies and attempts to limit the scope of the definition of human trafficking\(^2\) to exclude those migrants who have consented to irregular migration at some stage of their journey. Many of these competing discourses on consent were present in the participant interviews.

In the case of one participant, the interviewer arrived to find that the participant did not, in fact, fully understand what human trafficking was. This participant worked at a social service agency on a neighbor island that had been recommended to the interviewer as a place that works with human trafficking victims. Upon arrival at the interview the participant discussed with the interviewer a conversation that took place among the staff at the agency about the definition of human trafficking. What is interesting for the purposes of the present discussion was that consent was central to the definition of human trafficking that was offered:

\(\text{And then it started conversation up, “Okay, so what would the trafficking part be?” In my opinion, it’s sort of being uprooted or kidnapped in a way from where you normally were and sort of been taken out of that region and forced to be placed somewhere else. And we weren’t sure. Yeah, because it’s not a phrase- maybe on the news we hear about it- but it’s not much of…It’s not very prevalent here, in this community. Therefore, we don’t have as much information regarding that} (\text{Participant 0045}).\)

\(^2\) For an example of how issues of immigration politics interact with consent refer back to page 22 in the Literature Review section.
This passage represents one version of what we can consider a layperson, or general public, definition of human trafficking. Several other participants also spoke of their perceptions of similar “layperson” definitions or impressions of human trafficking. These presentations of the supposed views of others are instances of what Fairclough (2003) calls reported speech, when the text (in this case the interviewee’s speech) reports the words or ideas of another person or group.

Reported speech can come in varying degrees of preciseness. One version is the use of another person’s voice by using or quoting their words directly. This direct reported speech can range from a highly accurate reproduction of speech (as when other texts are cited in a research paper), to more of a general approximation of what a person might say. Indirect reported speech in these interviews most often consisted of discussing what “people” think. In this way both the indirect and direct reported speech of laypeople or the general public often served as a kind of counterpoint against which participants might argue their views of trafficking. The reported views or ideas of laypeople towards human trafficking, like the quotation above, often included a simple, straightforward discourse on consent as it pertains to trafficking related phenomena.

And I think that’s where people’s response to human trafficking is different when it’s children, when it’s forced, it’s coerced, and then there was no voluntar- I mean voluntary meaning, you know, even through deception to get involved with it. And I think that- and those are lines that people draw (Participant 0046).

There’s a large- there’s significant population that say, “Well, they’re here illegally”, and it’s, you know, essentially, “They cause their own problem, because they want to came here to work.” Even in spite of the fact that they were brought here for one reason and they’re essentially are forced to work later (Participant 0053).

In reaction to these supposed or imagined simplified ideas of consent, often the participants employed a discourse that complicated consent. Under the discursive knot of Sex/Gender and/or Children, often a discourse on consent is used in relation to
women or girls consenting to prostitution. This discourse argues that consent/choice in these situations is limited.

…and here in Hawai‘i we’ve seen a lot of laws improve and greater awareness in the community regarding sex trafficking and prostitution and just understanding that it’s not just bad women or bad girls who have chosen this life and are, you know, choosing everything about it. So I feel like that the community awareness as far as being able to recognize women and girls in prostitution, um, as being sex trafficking situations, and general awareness of understanding what kind of—there are threats and that choice is really limited in that situation. I feel like that that’s improved (Participant 0054).

And just because a victim relapses doesn’t mean that that’s the life they’re choosing. You know, understand, what is a meaningful choice for a victim if they’re looking at having been really victimized as a child or whatever and don’t have a stable home life. They feel like the trafficking into the trafficking scene or whatever is kind of their only alternative. Or especially if the trafficker has implemented whatever brainwashing techniques are exerted, psychological coercion, over them, I mean, that’s not gonna just all of a sudden disappear if you try and rescue the victim, or whatever. There’s still gonna be elements of that for however many years. I don’t even really know how long it stays with them (Participant 0052).

Other participants discussed issues of limited consent as they related to immigrants and immigration status:

Like trafficking sounds like you’re moving something from one place to another, which is part of it, but there’s also an element of it, you know, against a person’s will and then people are thinking, “Well how does that happen?” Because they’re not immigrants themselves, so they don’t understand how somebody could be told, “You have to work here” or “You have to do this thing sexually.” And people are like, “Well why don’t they just say no or why don’t they just leave?” Those are options for citizens but they’re not options for some other people. And so it’s a hard thing for people to wrap their minds around (Participant 0048).

The tension within these more complicated discourses on consent is that in questioning or limiting the ability of people (women, children, immigrants, etc.) to consent to their situations, they are also limiting or even denying these people agency. This is often not an easy tension to resolve. This tension is apparent in some instances where victims’ voices or preferences are referenced as reported speech:

I remember one of ’em asking, “Well, what’s gonna happen to my boss?” You know, “what happens if, you know, he’s found guilty?” And I told him, I said, “They’re gonna be punished.” And he said, “They’re gonna be sent to jail?” I said, “Yeah! (emphasis)” You know, and I told him, “Some of ’em very long time!” You know? And, again, that scared them off. You know?
They go, “Well, we don’t…” You know, they just don’t wanna see that thing happening to the person, basically, who brought ‘em in, but have also give them some opportunities. You know, when you look at it that way, they see it as having had some opportunities, ‘cause they were able to work, they brought families in, I mean, they describe to me how they were given the resources to bring members in across the border.

[INTERVIEWER: Mm. So not just fear is keeping them from doing it, but kind of a loyalty to their bosses?]

I think it can be seen that way. Yeah, because they would— they say, “Well, we don’t want ‘em to go to jail” (Participant 0044).

Here the reported speech and actions of potential victims implies a certain degree of agency that is not always consistent with ideas of limited consent. This is not to say that these victims were consenting to their exploitation, but to suggest that there can be varying degrees of consent and victim agency that can be complicated and muddle the lines drawn around what “counts” as human trafficking. This tension between consent and agency will be further discussed below when addressing how important social actors, such as victims, are constructed in these texts.

**Idiosyncratic discourse maps.** As we have seen, the phenomenon of human trafficking was generally constructed in the sample interviews around two largely separate discursive knots: the Labor/Immigration knot and the Sex/Children/Gender knot. This general trend functions to separate the phenomenon into sex trafficking and labor trafficking with very little, if any, overlap between the two. This tendency to construct human trafficking in this way was fairly consistent across interviews. However, within this general system of construction there was also a good deal of variation in the degree of focus each strand received, in the degree of overlap or entanglement between strands, and in the ways the consent strand interacted with each major discursive knot.
To represent this variation, discourse maps were created for each participant. These maps are impressionistic representations of how each discourse strand overlaps with others and with human trafficking in each interview. They were created by systematically examining the strand analysis of each interview and then creating provisional depictions of the strands present in those interviews. This was an iterative process whereby I would come back multiple times to each map to adjust the size and placement of each circle as needed. The size of each circle is intended to represent the relative importance and presence of the discourse strand it represents as compared to the other strands. The placement of the overlapping strands and the degree of overlap is intended to represent the amount of entanglement that each strand has with the others. In order to illustrate some of the variation in the way these discourse strands interacted in the different interviews, select full discourse maps are shown in Figures 5, 8, and 11. Separate maps that highlight each of the two major discourse knots individually are also shown for added clarity (Figures 6-7, 9-10, and 12-13).

Figure 5. Discourse strand map for participant 0046
Figure 5 illustrates an interview that stressed the children strand most prominently in relation to the sex strand. While both knots are present, the Sex/Children knot was primary. This participant did discuss migrant labor. However, the strands of immigration and labor, while overlapping heavily with each other, did not overlap as much with the strand of human trafficking as did the sex and children strands. Much of this interview stressed minor domestic trafficking rather than sex trafficking or the prostitution of adults. The gender discourse strand, though not a major focus, did interact with both the Sex/Children knot and the Labor/Immigration knot, as did a discourse on consent.

The map depicted in Figure 8 is similar to the one depicted in Figure 5 in that this participant also stressed the Sex/Children/Gender discourse knot more than the Labor/Immigration knot. In fact, the labor and immigration strands played a relatively small role in this interview. Figure 8 differs in that it shows more involvement of the gender discourse strand in constituting sex trafficking, with a heavy overlap of all three strands in the Sex/Children/Gender discursive knot. Issues of consent in this interview
had mainly to do with sex and prostitution, thus the consent discourse strand interacts solely with the second discursive knot.

Figure 8. Discourse strand map for participant 0054

Finally, Figure 11 illustrates a map with higher degree of importance placed on the immigration strand than is seen in either of the two preceding maps. This map
shows the strand of immigration overlapping heavily with the labor, sex, and gender strands. In comparison to the other two maps the Sex/Children/Gender discursive knot received less focus than the Labor/Immigration knot, with the children discourse strand receiving the least. Gender in this interview had more prominence than Sex and overlapped with Immigration to create a secondary knot around domestic violence with immigrant women.

Figure 11. Discourse strand map for participant 0048

Figure 12. Discursive knot #1: labor and immigration (participant 0048)

Figure 13. Discursive knot #2: sex, children, and gender (participant 0048)
This way of modeling the idiosyncratic aspects of human trafficking discourse using a set of common discursive threads can be very useful for understanding the varying phenomena that are involved with and contribute to human trafficking. Additionally, it makes apparent the different levels of importance various stakeholders placed on the multiple features that constitute human trafficking. A more in depth discussion of the variety of phenomena involved in constituting and constructing human trafficking and the context in which it is situated will be addressed in the next section.

Stage 2: Nomination and Predication Strategies for Trafficking-Related Phenomena

In order to understand how participants constructed the different phenomena related to human trafficking, the relevant passages for each interview were again systematically analyzed. In this second stage of analysis, each time a participant named a process or phenomenon related to human trafficking, it was recorded next to the passage in which it was used under a column entitled “nomination.” In the third column predication strategies were recorded. These strategies have to do with how the labels, or names, for these phenomena were qualified and the relevant context necessary to understand how the labels were used. An example of the analysis tables created for this stage of the process can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. Example of the nomination and predication analysis of trafficking and related phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER:</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think, uh, the cases would look similar or do you think there might be some differences between here and Honolulu?</td>
<td>I think, um- I think, uh, Maui is more likely to have employment trafficking cases because, um, (long pause) because (long pause) O‘ahu’s more, like- because it’s so much larger, it’s- it’s just more- more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Do you think it would look different here from Honolulu?</td>
<td>Employment trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is more likely to happen on Maui than O’ahu because O’ahu is larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is more likely to happen on O’ahu because it is larger, more urban area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of a place where you’d find sexual trafficking. But because it’s larger, there’s less likelihood that people are gonna commit egregious or obvious employment discrimination and things. Because, you know, in a- in a larger more dense urban area the sex trafficking goes up and the employment discrimination goes down because employers are more aware of the laws. On Maui it’s the opposite. [INTERVIEWER: Oh] So there is- there’s less, you know, prostitution, sex crime stuff over here, but there’s more employment discrimination because we’re, like, more of a rural kinda frontier area. And employers here are like, “Oh, yeah, I can take a person’s passport and hold it to make sure that they do their job” or “I can- I can discriminate against this person because they need this job in order to maintain this visa and they’re not gonna say anything to anybody because they’re scared.” So that- we see that happening a little bit more here with some of the big agri-business things or, um, some of the- there’s a lot of- there’s a huge population of undocumented, um, Latinos here that came, um, sort of they migrate in a- kind of like a seri-like serial migration. Like there’s- there’s a- there’s a core group and then they- people came [INTERVIEWER: Relatives and friends and] because they came. Yeah, and relatives and friends and-. So, um, they get, um, discriminated against in employment because the employer knows that, you know, they need the job and they’re not- they’re not gonna call, you know, the police or Department of Justice to report employment discrimination because they’re afraid that they’ll get busted themselves and so. So that’s probably, Maui is more, um, of an environment where you would find your bad employment practices. The sex trafficking, I don’t think that it’s common over here. [INTERVIEWER: Um.] Although [name] disagrees, she feels like it is a big problem over here and- and I think she probably knows more about that than I do [INTERVIEWER: Sure.].

An effort was made to track all phenomena that could be related to human trafficking, but the main focus of this stage of analysis was to: 1) understand how participants divided up the phenomenon of human trafficking with labels and how those labels were qualified, and 2) understand how participants described related phenomena, such as prostitution, employment practices, and immigration. Analyzing the nomination and predication strategies related to these two main categories of
phenomena (human trafficking and related practices/processes) can give some
indication of both how human trafficking itself is constructed by participants (Research
Question 1) and how the phenomenon of human trafficking is situated within a
contextual setting of other phenomena (Research Question 2).

First, I will discuss the patterns observed in the nomination strategies used to
label human trafficking in the participant interviews. These results will be followed by
a brief discussion of the general ways in which “human trafficking” tended to be
qualified (predication strategies). As will be discussed below, “human trafficking” as a
broad label tended to be used frequently when referring to both labor-related and sex-
related trafficking. This makes the use of the broad term highly variable as it often
refers to multiple phenomena. Therefore, the bulk of this section will focus more closely
on how trafficking and trafficking-related practices are constructed within the two
major discursive knots rather than on “human trafficking” generally. This allows the
various trafficking and trafficking-related phenomena to be divided between those that
have to do mainly with immigration and labor and those that have to do mainly with
sex, children, and gender. Under each of the two major knots, an initial presentation of
nomination strategies used to label phenomena will be followed by a discussion of the
related predication strategies. Particular attention will be paid to how these phenomena
are constructed and situated within a systemic context.

**Human trafficking in general.** In order to understand how participants tended
to label the various different kinds of human trafficking (labor trafficking, domestic
trafficking, etc) after the initial CDA analysis was complete, an additional tabulation was
made to determine the frequency of relevant nomination strategies in each interview.
NVivo qualitative analysis software was used to calculate the number of times select
words or phrases appeared in each interview. The select phrases were chosen based on the initial analysis of nomination strategies and its identification of the most frequently used labels for human trafficking-type phenomena. These phrases included “labor trafficking,” “sex trafficking,” “domestic trafficking,” “international trafficking,” and “human trafficking.” Other labels, such as “minor trafficking” or “child sex trafficking” were also used, but far less frequently. A final tabulation was also made to count the use of the word “trafficking” as well as the variation “trafficked.” This category counted the use of “trafficking” as it occurred within the other labels (e.g., “sex trafficking”) as well as “trafficking” or “trafficked” as standalone labels, thus it represents the total number of uses of the term in each interview. Table 5 shows the results of the Nvivo tabulation of these terms. The table divides participants between neighbor islands (the first seven) and O'ahu (the remaining 6), and indicates whether participants have experience in areas mostly related to labor trafficking (L), mostly related to sex trafficking (S), or both (=).
Table 5. Frequency of nomination strategies for the phenomenon of human trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Labor Trafficking</th>
<th>Sex Trafficking</th>
<th>Domestic Trafficking</th>
<th>International Trafficking</th>
<th>Human Trafficking</th>
<th>Total Use of Trafficking/ Trafficked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0043 (=)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044 (L)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045 (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046 (=)</td>
<td>7 (+1)**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047 (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048 (L)</td>
<td>0 (+4)**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049 (L)</td>
<td>0 (+2)**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050 (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052 (S)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053 (L)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054 (S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058 (L)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059 (=)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The S, L, and = after each participant number represent whether this participant had experience in areas mostly related to sex trafficking (S), mostly related to labor trafficking (L), or both (=).
** “Employment trafficking” was used a total of 4 times by participant 0048 and “employment-based trafficking” was used twice by 0049 and once by 0046. Because the use of the word employment is very similar to the use of the word labor, these additional uses were added to the “labor trafficking” column using a + sign to indicate the use of additional variations.

Some general trends are worth noting related to the nomination strategies shown in Table 5. First, participants’ use of “human trafficking” or “trafficking/trafficked” as general labels far outnumbered their use of specific labels such as “sex trafficking” or “labor trafficking.” In order to understand how this more general terminology was used by participants, the predication strategies for the terms “human trafficking” and “trafficking/trafficked” were examined.

Based on Berman's (2005) observations described in the literature review, a lack of explicit descriptive labels to distinguish between kinds of human trafficking could result in “a conflation of human trafficking and sexual slavery” (p.289) whereby “human trafficking” is used mainly to describe sex trafficking. However, the CDA analysis conducted on these interviews did not reveal that to be the case. The general labels of “human trafficking” and “trafficking” tended to be used by participants interchangeably.
to refer to multiple processes. In some instances these general labels were equated with processes in the Sex/Children/Gender knot:

*And then, you know, more recently we’ve been finding out about young girls who are being prostituted who don’t really realize that that’s what they’re doing...So these girls see it as status and then they also don’t see it as sex. So they love the money. They love the drugs. They love the I-phones and the expensive purses and stuff. So that’s the newest twist on human trafficking and we’re not seeing them in our programs* (Participant 0046).

However, they were also equated with processes in the Labor/Immigration knot:

*Yeah. I see it- yeah, once its labor abuse, yeah, to me that’s trafficking. You know, bringing them in just for labor and then you put certain parameters as to how they can live. You know, and denying them certain freedom, to me, it’s all part- and then bringing them in. I mean they are bringing them into the country. So, I don’t know, that’s, to me one and the same* (Participant 0044).

In some cases it is used to refer to them both simultaneously:

*Ah, and we found out also that, um, trafficking differs between, ah, each cultural group, ah, with labor or sex- labor or sex trafficking, and also geographically in the United States. What we’ve seen here does not join with sometimes happens in the mainland United States. It’s different. And I think, um, it’s taught us to look at each case on a case by case basis then* (Participant 0053).

This preference for using general labels when discussing human trafficking meant that typically participants with experience in particular areas of human trafficking (immigrant-related, sex-related, minor-related, labor-related, etc.) would employ general labels frequently when discussing the kinds of trafficking with which they have expertise. This resulted in a wide range of idiosyncratic qualities being ascribed to (i.e., predication strategies used for) the labels “human trafficking” and “trafficking.” However, this did not tend to result, as one might expect, in the participants equating human trafficking exclusively with the type of trafficking that was their expertise. All of the participants at least referenced (often without providing specific labels) both labor and sex trafficking to some degree. Therefore, each participant to some degree acknowledged the legitimacy of multiple types of trafficking,
even when they used the general label to apply most often to the type which lay within their area of expertise.

Despite the idiosyncratic use of predication strategies to qualify the more general labels for human trafficking with characteristics pertinent to the individual participant’s interests, some general trends did emerge among the participants in common qualities they ascribed to the phenomenon of human trafficking. All participants constructed human trafficking as a negative process that should be addressed, prevented, punished, or remedied. Additionally, most participants constructed the process of human trafficking as consisting of the use of some kind of force, coercion, or control (with implied discourses on consent). Finally, through various predication strategies, many participants also constructed human trafficking as a phenomenon not well understood in the larger state or specific neighbor island community and as a result many discussed need for more public awareness of human trafficking (see Results II for a more detailed discussion of this need for awareness).

Another major trend that can be observed from Table 5 is that when participants did use a specific trafficking label they tended to divide the phenomena of human trafficking nominally along labor/sex lines rather than between domestic/international trafficking. This is consistent with the results of the discourse strand analysis discussed above, where the two discursive knots tended to center on either labor or sex, with the strand of immigration occasionally bridging the two, but more prominent in combination with labor than with sex.

Finally, it seems that neighbor island participants (0043-0049) tended to use the specific labels of labor and sex trafficking less frequently than O‘ahu-based participants. Two exceptions are participants 0043 and 0046, both of whom have participated in-
person and via teleconference in the O‘ahu-based coalition meetings. That these two should follow the general nomination pattern found on O‘ahu, is therefore not surprising as exposure to the language norms of the coalition would likely inculcate those norms in participants. While far from conclusive, this might suggest that participants who regularly interact with each other around the topic of human trafficking many develop shared norms for labeling and describing the phenomenon.

Given the predominance of general, rather than specific labels, it is more useful to discuss the various trafficking and related practices these labels refer to using the rubric of the discursive knots to divide the phenomena for closer examination. Therefore, in order to understand how various trafficking-related phenomena were constructed, the nomination and predication strategies of the related phenomena are grouped under the two major discursive knots and described below.

**Nomination & predication strategies within the Labor/Immigration knot.** Table 6 illustrates the frequency with which select key words were used to label processes under the Labor/Immigration knot, but excludes direct references to labor trafficking, as these were tabulated separately above. This allows for an exploration of labor or employment practices that may or may not be considered labor trafficking, and thus allows for an examination of how labor trafficking might be considered within a range of other practices. The nomination and predication strategies used to construct these labor-related practices within the discursive knot of labor and immigration will be described in detail below, followed by a discussion of how participants constructed the systemic context within which these practices were situated.
The results shown in the Table 6 indicate that immigration was a strong theme in some, but not all of the participant interviews. Likewise, labor-related terms such as “employment,” “work,” and “labor” tended to be used with some frequency in certain interviews and in others hardly at all. Generally, those who had more experience in labor or immigration related matters tended to use labor related terms more often. The term “recruitment” was also included in the search as foreign labor recruitment was identified as an important labor trafficking related phenomenon. However, the findings of the NVivo tabulation suggested that this term was not used very often, and occasionally it was used to refer to recruitment into the sex industry rather than labor recruitment. Together, these trends support those discussed above; participants tended to incorporate and stress certain discourse strands more than others in relation to human trafficking, often in accordance with their expertise and experience. Therefore,
the labor and immigration strands were more apparent in some interviews than in others.

When looking at these processes more closely, the phenomenon of immigration will first be examined independent of the labor discourse strand. As discussed in detail above, the immigration discourse strand is most intensely related to the discourse strand of labor, but was also entangled with the strands of sex and gender. Because immigration tended to be discursively related to human trafficking in a number of ways, a more general examination of immigration as a phenomenon is warranted before moving on to discuss how it relates to labor practices. Additionally, understanding how participants contextualize human trafficking within the broader context of the U.S. immigration system can shed light on whether human trafficking tends to be systemically constructed or whether it is seen as the aberrant behavior of individuals (Research Question 2).

Based on the discourse strand analysis above, the phenomenon of immigration is clearly related to, but not synonymous with human trafficking in many of the participants’ constructions. In order to understand how participants construct the phenomenon of immigration, the predication strategies related to “immigration” were analyzed more closely. Based on this analysis, findings suggest that immigration is seen at times as a positive process of opportunity, but is also seen as a process that can cause vulnerability in those who undergo it.

In some passages immigration was constructed as a positive and voluntary process involving either moving to the U.S. for opportunity or to get away from something worse in a source country, as in the following passages:

*Because immigration is always been a way for people to do better than the country that you came from. So it’s an economic decision. Not- not because they’re forced into* (Participant 0046).
There’s the pull, and then there’s the push. I mean, you know, people are meeting needs, right? And— and it’s an economic thing. Ah…you get into the really global thing. It’s helping the countries they come from to really develop their own economics and education. So there’s not this big push to come to the United States to make dollars, or go to any other country to try to make it a go (Participant 0058).

In these passages the participants referenced factors that induce immigrants to come to the U.S., such as to make money and to pursue economic or educational opportunities not available in their own countries. As discussed above, within the immigration discourse strand multiple discourses often compete for dominance, meaning there are multiple ways that immigration can be portrayed through discourse. The kinds of passages presented above represent a discourse within the immigration strand that sees immigration as a means to find opportunity and the U.S. as a country in which this opportunity is available. A similar construction was used in the following passage:

And they may have had motivations to go— if they were immigrant victims— become legal. Their families would be brought to the front of the line. And so, you know, that always kind of bothered me… So it’s, you know, it goes back to that big immigration debate. So when somebody’s not legal, do you allow them to become legal because they exercised some illegality to start with? And somebody else at the back of the train here can’t even get moving forward because all of these having in the front. And it’s just a fairness (Participant 0046).

Here there is a metaphor that represents the U.S. as a place where people are lined up waiting to get in. The immigration process is also metaphorically seen as a train, a single route on which everyone must ride waiting their turn to arrive. This is a common view of immigration in the U.S., whether it is consciously acknowledged or

---

3 It is important to remember here (and indeed throughout this discussion) that participants need not be consciously aware that they are employing certain discourses. My intention in examining the implications that stem from certain passages is not to criticize or blame the participants for their views. It is to point out how certain ways of speaking that are often common and unnoticed carry important consequences. Wood and Kroger (2000) make clear that evaluations in discursive analysis can be placed on the discourse itself rather than exclusively on an individual’s internal attitudes: “But this does not suggest that we must abandon concepts such as attitude that are invoked in the making of judgments about a person’s actions. The discourse perspective does include such concepts, but as we have discussed above, the discourse perspective views them as they are realized in discourse rather than as internal, hidden events or things. Thus, we can agree that a person has expressed a racist or other inappropriate attitude without having to assume that she does or does not have an underlying orientation” (p. 14).
not. The system is set up to restrict immigration so that not everyone who wants to come to the U.S. can. This restrictive and bureaucratic system does seem to lend itself to the metaphor of a line in which would-be immigrants have to wait. In this passage there is also the implication that if immigrants do not wait in line they have “exercised some illegality” and that this is not “fair.”

This underlying assumption that immigration is a metaphorical line in which one must wait to be “legal” sets up a dichotomy where those who do not “wait” are seen as being “illegal.” Because this construction of immigration stresses the unfairness of not waiting your turn (rather than, for example, an unfairness based on global wealth discrepancies) those who are thought to be “illegal” are stigmatized by the public and punished by the law. Some participants discussed how this view of immigration is an issue they see as related to how the public views human trafficking:

And then, you know, like, sometimes when I do public outreach there’s always the person who raises their hand says, “Well, what part about illegal do they not understand?” And so whenever there’s that kind of climate, it’s going to make, you know, talking about or visibility for some of the more subtle or complex or nuanced issues a little more difficult because, you know it’s hard in this- in a climate like this to talk about trafficking or victims of domestic violence who are immigrant women when most people don’t even understand the difference between calling somebody undocumented verses illegal, stuff like that (Participant 0048).

There’s a large- there’s significant population that say, “Well, they’re here illegally”, and it’s, you know, essentially, “They cause their own problem, because they want to came here to work.” Even in spite of the fact that they- they were brought here for one reason and they’re essentially are forced to work later (Participant 0053).

These participants expressed a kind of counter discourse to the “line” view of immigration, in which the illegal/legal dichotomy is subtly challenged and replaced with an undocumented/documentated dichotomy that is more sympathetic to irregular migrants. This kind of counter discourse also stresses the vulnerability of immigrants more than the opportunities they seek:
They, you know, a lot of these people, the fact that they’re ‘illegal,’ you know, without status, or whatever, just puts them the whole, you know, that– I mean, it takes them out of– that they don’t wanna be a part of society. You know, they’re scared. They don’t wanna do this. They don’t wanna do that (Participant 0044).

The really radical enforcement of the last few years– like four hundred thousand deportations during the last year. And just this really overzealous immigrations and customs enforcement, works against people coming forward with these other types of trafficking, or DV, or any kind of crime that they may be facing– drug abuse, you know, they don’t– there’s drug dealers on the West Side where there’s a lot of Latinos, who are able to do– operate freely because they know nobody’s going to turn them in because everybody’s afraid to call the police over there (Participant 0048).

In fact, several participants discussed this negative side to the phenomenon of immigration, the side that makes people vulnerable to exploitation and abuse, such as not getting paid appropriately. The vulnerability that can result from the process of immigrating to Hawai‘i was referenced in regard to multiple negatively constructed phenomena, including vulnerability to human trafficking (both labor and sex), vulnerability to domestic violence, and vulnerability to marginalization that can then also result in various kinds of victimization. According to one participant immigrants may be “ostracized because they don’t necessarily fit in right away” (Participant 0052). The following passage also illustrates this negative construction of immigration:

The thing about trafficking too is the people who are victims of it are in some sort of vulnerable population. They’re either like young kids that get involved or somebody from another culture who doesn’t speak the language who really needs money and was promised something and either under threat of physical harm, or their families’ harm, and even if they’re getting a little bit of money, a little bit of money is more than no money and so people are less likely to report that because at least they’re getting something and so while in America their pay not be equal to what everybody else is getting paid, maybe it’s more than where they’re coming from (Participant 0043).

Here we can see a feature of immigration that has recurred in several interviews: one factor that makes immigrants vulnerable is the fact that even poor treatment in the U.S. might be better than the situation in their home country. Several participants indicated that this dark side of the process of immigration in search of opportunity has
resulted in a population of immigrants who are “willing” to be mistreated in order to avoid jeopardizing their ability to stay in the U.S.:

…They may have the understanding that their status here is dependent on that job and that they don’t really have any choice but to work there, or they can get in trouble if they quit or they’ll have to go back if they quit or something like that and they don’t have the money to go back (Participant 0048).

These passages represent a struggle between discourses on immigration. On the one hand it is still represented positively as means to opportunity, but on the other hand it can result in exploitation and abuse. Situations here can be better than “where they’re coming from” while still being abusive. These competing discourses on immigration are also tangled with discourses on consent/agency and can elicit questions around meaningful consent in these situations where immigrants might be “willing” to be exploited in order to stay in the U.S.⁴ On the whole, these constructions of the vulnerability that can result from the process of immigrating to the U.S. do place human trafficking within the systemic context of the U.S. immigration system.

While participants did discuss the process of immigration and the vulnerability it can create in relation to multiple other phenomena, most notably domestic violence and sex trafficking, much of the focus was on the interaction of immigration and labor. Table 7 shows a list of the various nomination strategies used to label phenomena under the Labor/Immigration discursive knot. These labels were used in various ways to discuss both labor trafficking and non-trafficking labor by immigrants.

---
⁴ Some examples of the interaction of the consent strand and the immigration strand are shown above in the section discussing how the consent strand interacts with both discursive knots.
Table 7. Nomination strategies for phenomena located under the Labor/Immigration knot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor-Related Phenomena</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor trafficking</td>
<td>Domestic servitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor abuse</td>
<td>Indentured work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing labor to the United States</td>
<td>Contractual arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting workers</td>
<td>Labor trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Seasonal work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-based trafficking</td>
<td>Sharecropping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment trafficking</td>
<td>Ag work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment discrimination</td>
<td>Work on the plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Employment Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to understand how participants conceptualized human trafficking as it relates to other labor practices among immigrant populations, the predication strategies used to qualify each of these labels was analyzed. One surprising theme that occurred in four participant interviews was a discussion of the historical context of migrant labor in Hawai‘i in the plantation era. However, the ways in which these participants discussed how this historical practice of migrant labor relates to modern labor trafficking varied.

Early on in the interview, one participant brought up Hawai‘i’s plantation history, saying that Hawai‘i has “always had indentured workers.” The interviewer asked follow-up questions to better understand how this participant understood human trafficking in the context of that history. If labor trafficking is seen as existing on a continuum of abuses (Research Question 2), how the participant views the relationship between human trafficking and plantation era migrant labor might reveal something about this continuum. According to this participant, the abuses that happened during the plantation era have “some parallels” with human trafficking, but “it’s a little different.” This participant labeled plantation era labor as “indentured servitude” and
seemed to distinguish between this “contractual” labor and current labor trafficking practices:

*When you develop it, one is like a force servitude versus you go thinking that you’re gonna be a contract worker and the conditions are not as you thought. So as far as agriculture, which is labor, they’re not forcing you to do it, and it’s under the contract. Or maybe, um- do you see what I’m trying to say? That one is really forced and coerced, and the other is you go and you got less than you bargained for* (Participant 0046).

Here it seems that the primary distinguishing factor between human trafficking and other labor practices is consent. This particular participant seems to use a discourse on consent that focuses on worker agency rather than situational factors that might mitigate the extent that choice or consent is involved.

A second participant responded to the same line of questioning by similarly distinguishing between plantation era work and human trafficking. However, in that interview a different distinction was drawn between these practices: “*Well, the thing is that they were different because the plantation workers were brought here legally. They had legal status here.*” (Participant 0052). Rather than a distinction between consenting labor and non-consenting labor, here there is a distinction between a legal immigration process and an illegal immigration process, where it is implied that labor trafficking involves bringing laborers here illegally.

Two other participants took a different view of the relationship between plantation era labor and modern human trafficking. Both of these participants speculated that Hawai’i’s plantation history included labor abuses that might now cause some segments of Hawai’i’s population to be unsympathetic to labor trafficking and labor abuses.

*But, my experience is that those law enforcement don’t realize that at all. They think it’s- especially in Hawai’i, where most of our ancestors were plantation workers. They’re like, “Hey if our grandparents did it, why not?”* Well, they weren’t happy and they were exploited too, you know? It’s the labor laws, the changes that happened to the- that continues in the United States
During the Civil Rights era that actually got them out of that state so that they could have somewhat rights, to be able to put their kids through college and school whatever (Participant 0050).

They don’t see the seriousness. I’m assuming it’s the same for the labor department, that people are maybe willing to work for less money, harsh hours, harsh work, thinking, “Well my dad did it, my grandpa did it, so therefore why am I – what gives me the right to say it’s not right” (Participant 0045).

The views that the public has of immigrant labor as imagined by these two participants, are likely related to the “line” construction of immigration. In the past, immigrants came to Hawai‘i, worked hard and suffered, but eventually established themselves. Perhaps to certain segments of the public it seems only fair that immigrants today do the same. This represents a discourse on immigrant labor that constructs exploitation as a kind of rite of passage. This kind of discourse lends itself to a construction of human trafficking that severs it from a continuum of abuses and that considers “ordinary” labor abuses to be unworthy of action or outrage. It would seem that at least some of the participants have concerns that the public might view labor trafficking in this way.

These passages drawing on Hawai‘i’s historical context highlight the challenge of trying to sort out where participants themselves draw the line between labor trafficking, labor abuse, and other labor practices. There seemed to be an acknowledgement in these passages that there is some degree of ambivalence in the general public over what kind of labor practices are acceptable. Certainly, it would be inaccurate to characterize all immigrant labor-related practices as human trafficking. The question remains: within the systemic context of migrant labor, how do participants divide human trafficking versus non-trafficking practices?

In addition to labor abuses that occurred during the plantation era, several participants mentioned exploitative labor practices that they were aware of in the
Islands in recent years. These exploitative practices typically centered on either unfair pay or poor living conditions. If participants do conceptualize human trafficking on a continuum of labor abuses, then understanding the boundary separating human trafficking from other labor abuses is important. One participant discussed the general category of “bad employment practices” and related higher levels of these practices to higher levels of employment trafficking:

*I think, Maui is more likely to have employment trafficking cases [and]...there’s more employment discrimination because we’re, like, more of a rural kind of frontier area. And employers here are like, “Oh, yeah, I can take a person’s passport and hold it to make sure that they do their job” or “I can discriminate against this person because they need this job in order to maintain this visa and they’re not gonna say anything to anybody because they’re scared”* (Participant 0048).

For this participant, there does seem to be some distinction made between other “bad employment practices” and human trafficking, though that distinction may not always be clear:

*...a lot of the things I hear about are just close to the edge of, you know, like, if you talk to the hotel, they- they probably don’t see that- their practices as being coercive or- or involuntary. But for the person whose going through it, like, to them it is- it is a little bit coercive and involuntarily* (Participant 0048).

Another participant constructed labor trafficking much more broadly. This participant viewed labor abuse and human trafficking as synonymous:

*I see it- yeah, once its labor abuse, yeah, to me that’s trafficking. You know, bringing them in just for labor and then you put certain parameters as to how they can live. You know, and denying them certain freedom, to me, it’s all part- and then bringing them in. I mean they’re bringing them into the country. So, I don’t know, that’s, to me one and the same* (Participant 0044).

Thus, there is a good bit of variability in how human trafficking is constructed in relation to other potentially exploitative labor practices. Some participants draw lines along issues of consent, some along issues of illegality, some in degree of coercive

---

5 See pages 78 and 111 for examples of passages discussing unfair pay for migrant laborers.
6 See page 90 for an example of a passage discussing a poor living conditions.
practices, and some not at all. Although an acknowledgement of a range of abuses was present in some participant interviews, a fully articulated construction of a continuum of labor abuses was not. Developing a strategy for conveying such a construction of labor abuses to the public could help bring awareness and clarity to the issues that migrant laborers face. This will be discussed in more detail in the Discussion Section.

In addition to an analysis of the boundaries between labor trafficking and other labor practices, it is also instructive to try to understand how participants view the systemic context of human trafficking within the Labor/Immigration knot. A few participants conceptualized these labor-related phenomena as existing within flawed foreign labor, recruitment, and agricultural systems. These participants explicitly discussed aspects of these systems with regards to how they relate to human trafficking. Most of the participants did so by suggesting that changes to these systems would help prevent human trafficking in Hawai‘i. Here a participant discussed the need for better oversight of the recruitment process:

*Prevent? [INTERVIEWER: Yeah.] Phew, that’s a big problem. One, in terms of labor trafficking, federal oversight of bringing labor to the United States, where you just don’t open it up, have people—. I don’t know. It seems like you’d have a way to do it, but then people use the system in order to make their own gains. It’s like the Thai workers, when they recruited— and that was legal. But what I heard, and I don’t know how true it is, is that they had put—the government, the Thai government— put limits on the amount that they could pay in order to take those opportunities to come to the United States. And I think it was like 7/8 thousand dollars. And these people were paying twenty-something thousand. When they— what it ended up with the recruiters and paying loans and all that (Participant 0058).*

It is clear from this passage that this participant did not equate the recruitment of foreign workers with labor trafficking, but instead used the word “legal” to refer to the process of recruitment. This gives the recruitment of foreign labor an air of legitimacy. At the same time this passage acknowledged that “people use the system in order to make their own gains” and gave the example of Thai workers who were made to pay
large recruitment fees. Later, this participant expanded on the harm these fees caused for the workers:

*Before they came, ‘cause if you don’t know, they’re making loans, um, mortgaging their land. So what had started off as a kind of organized thing, ballooned into something much bigger than, um-. And then once they came here, it was like, who’s the over- where’s the oversight of these things that are being taken advantaged of?* (Participant 0058).

Thus, rather than advocating for the elimination of foreign labor recruitment outright, it seems that the suggestion is that the system could function better with more oversight. This construction of the foreign labor recruitment system seems to subscribe to the idea that a few bad apples are taking advantage of the system, i.e., that human trafficking is the aberrant behavior of a few people.

In addition to better oversight of the foreign labor recruitment system, this participant and others suggested that more oversight is also needed once the workers get to Hawai‘i. Again, in the context of a discussion on ideas for preventing human trafficking, another participant made the following suggestion:

*Yeah, and I think, you know, more kind of enforcement of like workplace safety, work- you know, making sure that inspections are happening, things like that. Because knowing that, you know, it’s like the II-1v workers and things that are- people are coming over. You know, where are they living? What’s going on? What are the circumstances that are actually happening to them when they get here?* (Participant 0049).

These suggestions regarding better oversight of recruitment and work visa systems do tie labor trafficking to the context of the U.S. foreign labor system, but stop one step short of criticizing the system itself. Discussing a need for better oversight of these systems is not implying that genuine change to the system needs to occur. Thus, these kinds of discourses may lend themselves to a “bad apple” kind of construction of labor trafficking rather than a systemic construction.
An additional element to the systemic context of labor trafficking was offered by a different participant. This participant addressed concerns about the current U.S. agricultural system as it relates to the foreign labor system:

*With the labor side- and this is my theory, and this is my own, in my opinion head. And I need to think long and hard about this. We live, we have a certain lifestyle. We pay certain amount of our income to get certain things, our fruits and vegetables, etcetera. Now, if we were- now, a lot of Americans and new comers will not do ag work. Americans they just won’t do certain type of work. So we have foreign workers come in to do, and it’s a long tradition with our country… And if you’re gonna bring ’em in to work, are you gonna pay ’em the proper wage? And the thing is, if paying the proper wage, your carrots and your potatoes, and whatever else you’re gonna grow are not gonna be the same price you see at the markets. It will be different. They’ll be higher. So are you willing to pay that? Are we as a society willing to pay that price so we can pay these people a prevailing wage? And whether or not farmers are willing to do so, because this has been, not been a one shot thing. It’s been going on for decades, I think (Participant 0053).*

The way the systemic context of the U.S. agricultural system is presented here differs from the way the immigrant worker and recruitment systems were presented above in that it constructs the foreign labor system as a necessary evil in maintaining the current agricultural system. This discourse asserts that “Americans” will not do agricultural work because it is difficult work and does not pay well. However, foreign laborers are “willing” to work hard for very little pay and so are necessary to maintain our current “lifestyle.” Further this kind of system is understood as “a long tradition with our country,” which discursively speaking gives it a kind of legitimacy. Another participant echoes this kind of discourse below:

*So, I think part of that is the nature of the rural community, and the balance of, when you have a impoverished community, um, when people say things like, “Ya know, Hawaiitians don’t want this kinda job, so I gotta use these immigrants.” Spanic- Hispanics the- the, maybe, the South-East Asians who are willing- Sam- you know, not Samoans (small laugh), some of the cultures who are willing to work really hard, and maybe not get paid for another week. And then, you know, their papers might get held, just- you know, in other words, I’m trying to suggest that maybe some of the people are thinking that they helping in the labor area (Participant 0046).*
Taken as a whole these passages indicate that some participants do contextualize labor trafficking within a systemic context, though upon closer examination they also reflect discourses that subtly legitimate these systems and power structures.

**Nomination & predication strategies within the Sex/Children/Gender knot.** Table 8 addresses select key words used to label processes under the Sex/Children/Gender knot, but excludes direct references to sex trafficking, as these were tabulated separately in Table 5. This allows for an exploration of issues and practices under the Sex/Children/Gender knot that may or may not be considered sex trafficking, and thus allows for an examination of how sex trafficking might be considered within a range of other practices. Additionally, participant constructions of the systemic context of phenomena within this discursive knot will also be explored.

Table 8: Frequency of select target words within the Sex/Children/Gender knot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Child/ minor + sex**</th>
<th>Prostitution</th>
<th>Domestic Violence</th>
<th>Rescue/ Restore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0043 (=)*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045 (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046 (=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047 (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048 (L)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050 (S)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052 (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054 (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059 (=)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The S, L, and = after each participant number represent whether this participant had experience in areas mostly related to sex trafficking (S), mostly related to labor trafficking (L), or both (=).

**This search included the word “child” and synonyms and the word “sex.”

Nomination strategies that included the word “sex” described a wide range of phenomena including sex assault, child sex assault, sex for drugs, sex trade, sex abuse,
child sex abuse, sex crime, sex tourism, sex industry, paid sex, purchasing women and children for sex, and survival sex. Because the children discourse strand was common in some interviews an effort was made to tally nomination strategies that were specific to children using the key words “child” and “sex” and allowing for synonyms such as “minor” to be included in the search. The results indicated that some participants did label child specific phenomena, including child sex abuse, child abuse, child sex trafficking, and minor sex trafficking. However, other participants also talked about issues involving minors, but did so under a more general label such as prostitution or sex trafficking.

As Table 8 indicates, two other common phenomena discussed in the interviews were prostitution and domestic violence. Prostitution will be discussed in more detail below. It is notable that domestic violence was discussed frequently by neighbor island participants and rarely by O‘ahu participants. This is most likely due to two factors. One is that neighbor island service providers have had very few official trafficking cases as compared to O‘ahu and so often drew analogies between human trafficking and areas in which they had more experience, such as domestic violence. A second factor influencing the frequency with which domestic violence occurred in the neighbor island sample may be that those islands do experience significant numbers of domestic violence cases in immigrant populations. A few participants did draw parallels between the factors that make immigrant women vulnerable to domestic violence (such as irregular immigration status) and factors that make immigrants in general vulnerable to human trafficking.\(^7\)

\(^7\) See the discussion above on the participants' construction of the phenomenon of immigration.
Table 9 shows the wide range of nomination strategies used to label phenomena within the Sex/Children/Gender knot. With regard to the predication strategies, I explored both how participants discussed human trafficking in relation to prostitution, and how the participants characterized the system(s) in which these sex-related phenomena are situated.

Table 9. Nomination strategies for phenomena located under the Sex/Children/Gender knot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, Children, or Gender-Related Phenomena</th>
<th>Girls being trafficked</th>
<th>Sexual trafficking</th>
<th>Sex crime stuff</th>
<th>The sex industry</th>
<th>Trafficking of children</th>
<th>Survival sex</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Purchasing women and children for sex</th>
<th>Trafficking scene</th>
<th>Sex tourism</th>
<th>The game</th>
<th>Child sex trafficking</th>
<th>Sex addictions</th>
<th>Pimp-style prostitution</th>
<th>Minor sex trafficking</th>
<th>Domestic minor sex trafficking</th>
<th>Sex addictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trafficking industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-order brides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old school prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old school trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New twist on human trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostess bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to expectations stemming from the great controversy within the political and academic spheres over how to characterize sex trafficking, participants rarely expressed an explicit opinion on prostitution in relation to sex trafficking. In fact, the boundary between sex trafficking and prostitution often varied across participants and tended to be characterized ambiguously. Often participants seemed to use the labels of “human trafficking” and “prostitution” interchangeably, making it difficult to examine any differences in predication strategies.
Occasionally a participant did express explicit opinions about the relationship between prostitution and sex trafficking. When this happened it was most often to equate the two, defining prostitution as sex trafficking, as in the passage below.

So I feel like that the community awareness as far as being able to recognize women and girls in prostitution, um, as being sex trafficking situations, and general awareness of understanding what kind of- that there are threats and that choice is really limited in that situation (Participant 0054).

It is important to note that this participant indicated that both women and girls in prostitution should be considered “as being in sex trafficking situations.” In terms of a legal definition of sex trafficking, anyone in the sex industry that is under the age of 18 is considered a victim of human trafficking. The inclusion of women as well as girls in this passage would indicate that this participant considers adult women in prostitution to also be victims of human trafficking, regardless of whether force, fraud or coercion can be shown.

As is the case in the literature presented above, the main mechanism for expanding the definition of human trafficking to include prostitution in this passage is through the discourse strand of consent. The argument of the anti-prostitution view is that the “choice” or consent involved in participating in the sex industry is limited and that this participation should not be seen as voluntary. Other participants expressed similar views with regards to consent and prostitution:

Or making the connection that prostitution isn’t just, like, women who are choosing to do it but that there’s some sort of victimization going on there. That’s still, I think a level of education that needs to continue to take place and to transform our society eyes, in terms of how to view girls who are on Kuhio Avenue. And it’s not like completely that they’re there just by, you know, their ideal job or dream job (Participant 0052).

However, in other cases, participants did seem to distinguish between prostitution involving adults and sex trafficking:
There are some corners where women are sitting waiting, but I don’t think that they’re under 18 and I’m not sure that they’re being trafficked per se. Um, so it’s hard to- I think that a lot of time they’re pimped out by their boyfriends so there’s prostitution, but it’s not trafficking ‘cause their over 18 (Participant 0047).

*We have provided services for those, um, participants who say needed servi- who basically were prostituting, but it was more so of a li-me-well, I don’t even know if, saying a lifestyle choice, um, more along the lines of the LGBTQ population. Yeah. More so the transgender. Yeah. Um, but it wasn’t so much done against their will as that was part of how they survived, so not so much with coercion behind it* (Participant 0045).

In the second passage, the participant employs the discourse strand of consent, but does so in a way that implies agency on the part of those participating in the prostitution, rather than the discourse of limited consent seen above.

Interestingly, even participants who distinguished between the phenomena of human trafficking and prostitution involving adults, expressed very different views of teens participating in sex acts for money:

*And then, you know, more recently we’ve been finding out about young girls who are being prostituted who don’t really realize that that’s what they’re doing...[the girls say] “We just have to give blow jobs. It’s really not sex, you know?” So these girls see it as status and then they also don’t see it as sex. So they love the money. They love the drugs...So that’s (emphasis) the newest twist on human trafficking and we’re not seeing them in our programs. But I think some of the parents that call us concerned about their children, that their daughters- I don’t hear about sons yet, but I’m sure it’s happening too- um, could be victims of human trafficking right here. And- but they wouldn’t call it that. They’d call it, you know prostitution or pimping or whatever* (Participant 0047).

This passage is an example of a highly tangled discourse knot between the Sex/Children/Consent strands. The knot involves implied definitions of sex, children, and consent that express a particular cultural and historical view and thus indicates a site of competing discourses. Teenagers are seen as children in that they “count” as victims of human trafficking in this participant’s discourse. Blow jobs, though perhaps not seen or described as sex by the teenagers themselves, are clearly categorized as sex by the participant. Therefore, giving blow jobs for money is defined as prostitution and human trafficking. While the teens themselves may view the acts as consensual, the
The passage above is notable in that this participant acknowledges the importance of language in constructing the phenomenon of child sex trafficking and is actively engaged in the meaning making process by rejecting certain labels and privileging others. While there may have been some ambiguity across participants in whether they considered the prostitution of adult women to be human trafficking, there was no ambiguity about children in the sex industry. No participant made comments indicating that children in the sex industry are prostitutes rather than sex trafficking victims. However, this participant had concerns that the use of certain terms and concepts, such as “survival sex”, might imply that there is an element of consent to the participation of minors in the sex industry. The implications of the tension between consent and agency are a recurring theme in many of these passages and will be discussed in relation to social actors in the section below.

In combination, these passages indicated that across participants there was some variation to how and whether participants divided the phenomena of prostitution and
human trafficking. However, a few of the participants, such as the one just illustrated, did express firmly articulated views about prostitution and consent that echo issues raised by anti-prostitution groups. To further explore how participants constructed the context of sex trafficking and related phenomena the systems within which they situated these phenomena were also examined.

There was some variation in the degree to which participants discussed these systemic contexts. Some participants, as in the case of labor trafficking, mentioned sex trafficking without a much elaboration. However, among those participants that discussed sex trafficking more extensively there were four major systemic contexts that are important to note. Each one corresponds to one of the four major discourse strands (sex, children, gender, and immigration) that interact with the Sex/Children/Gender discourse knot. Perhaps the primary systemic context is the sex industry itself. The other three strands interact with the sex discourse strand in various ways and to varying degrees. A few participants discussed the cultural context of how women are viewed in society and attribute sex trafficking to particular views of women (representing a discourse on gender). Additionally, the context of the family and runaway youth was also represented in some discourses on minor sex trafficking (the children discourse strand). Finally, the vulnerability of immigrants discussed in the section above was also described by some participants as an important context for sex trafficking.

Despite the variation and a certain degree of ambiguity in how some participants divided sex trafficking and prostitution, when the systemic context of the sex industry was described, it was characterized in almost universally and unambiguously negative terms. This differs significantly from the systemic context of labor trafficking (migrant
labor) which was characterized in some ways as useful and even necessary. The following two passages represent two of the most explicit condemnations of the sex industry:

*And then also, waging a state-wide publicity campaign to make the buying-purchasing of women and children for sex absolutely morally reprehensible and also pathetic* (Participant 0050).

*And so we really need to start the process of also educating our society and community to the damage that these customers are doing to individuals by participating in this. You know, it’s said that prostitution is a victimless crime. I know women whose lives have been ruined just by being in prostitution for a couple of days. I know women’s lives… have been ruined and they’ve been in it for 30 or 40 years. It is absolutely not a victimless crime. It’s horrible. It’s deadly. It just can kill them physically, emotionally, spiritually, mentally, everything. It’s just—it’s so awful* (Participant 0054).

Here there is a striking difference from the discourses found under the Labor/Immigration knot. While participants who discussed the systemic contexts of labor and immigration may have offered some criticisms of those systems, no participant suggested that the systems themselves were inherently corrupt or corrupting.

It would seem, therefore, that discourses around the sex industry are different than those around other “industries.” Research Question 2 asks if participants construct human trafficking as existing along a continuum of abuses or as the aberrant behavior of a few “bad apples.” In terms of sex trafficking, participants offered neither a continuum of abuses, nor a “bad apple” construction. In fact, as the passage below suggests, even those who have become “abusers” in the sex industry may have at one time been victims. The process this participant described whereby a boy or girl sex trafficking victim can become (almost evolve into) an abuser suggests a corrupting process. That abusers can be former victims suggests that the perpetrators are not aberrant individuals, but co-victims in the process of abuse. This corrupting process seems inherent to the system:

*And all of a sudden you’re sucked into that, and then you become bottom, and then you work your way to the top, and then when you become the Mama San. The Mama San actually enforces, and*
so the victims become the abusers, the victims become the enforcers. The victims are part of the whole system (Participant 0046).

This kind of characterization of the sex industry lends itself to the supply-demand approach to preventing sex trafficking. This approach, which has adopted the “End Demand” slogan, proposes that ending the demand for prostitution would end the supply, meaning that women would not be sucked into the sex industry. Essentially, the “End Demand” approach strives to eradicate the entire system. By contrast, no participant suggested abolishing the current migrant labor system. Three participants explicitly expressed end demand language along these lines:

Well, the sex side is hard to say. Probably, you know, it’s supply and demand. If you’re—if you eliminate the demand, there is no supply (Participant 0053).

The sex trafficking side, now that’s another thing, push and pull. You have the demand. I mean, and then you have—the demand is high. I mean that has something to do with our own sense of integrity, of respect for women, you know? I’m say in sex side, yeah? What makes women—how we perceive that integrity of the human being and instead of just using them like property. That’s a whole—that’s a brainset thing (Participant 0058).

The second passage (0058) links this negative characterization of the sex industry with the second systemic context: cultural views of women. The systemic contexts within the gender and children discourse strands were also discussed by participants. In relation to the Sex/Gender discursive knot, several participants emphasized discourses on women/girls and their vulnerability to sexualization in society and exploitation in the sex industry. Two participants suggested different gender-based pathways to addressing this systemic context of societal views of women. One suggested empowering girls would make them less vulnerable to negative social

---

8 See the passage from Participant 0054 at the bottom of the next page for the third instance of “End demand” language.

9 The systemic context of the Immigration discourse strand was discussed in detail above and so will not be reiterated in this section.
discourses about women and the other suggested that educating boys and men would make them less likely to view women as sexual objects:

*And I would love it to be packaged under, not just human trafficking prevention, but domestic violence prevention…But, you know, about teaching girls how to be confident and sure of themselves and – because you know it’s so hard. I would like, um, when I watch my nieces and stuff, I thought it’s really hard to be strong in who we are. And that people look different. We need to tell girls it’s okay to look different. To have curly hair, or to, you know what I mean? (Participant 0047).*

*Um, maybe what they can do to make a difference is starting a conversation with men about how women are treated and the sexualization of young girls and women. And, um, it could be a conversation about sexual addictions that our country struggles with, those kinds of things. I think there’s a lot that people could do to raise awareness to stop demand, to help prevent children from being brought into this and to rescue individuals that are in it* (Participant 0054).

The first passage represents a highly gendered discussion of the need for girls to be confident and sure of themselves as a means of protecting them from dangers. It suggests that for women “it’s really hard to be strong in who we are.” The implication is that strong women and girls will be less susceptible to the corrupting influence of the sex industry. This kind of discourse sees vulnerability in women, but stops short of questioning the gender discourses in society that might contribute to this vulnerability. The second passage does discuss the negative influence of societal discourses about gender, specifically the “sexualization of young girls.” However, that the participant discussed the need to have conversations with men around these topics sets up what may be an effective but overly simplistic gender dichotomy whereby men have strong sexual appetites and women are the unwilling victims of “sexualization.” As will be discussed below in relation to social actors, this kind of passive construction of women can be problematic.

In addition to the systemic contexts of the sex industry and societal views of women, a third systemic context can be located in the discourse strand on children. This context has to do with the context of vulnerable families and with the system that
deals with runaway youth. These two are interrelated in that the family system is seen as contributing to youths running away and then getting involved in the sex industry. Prevention approaches related to these contexts include strengthening families and creating a more sensitive approach to “delinquent” or runaway youth.

I mean, a piece that I kind of find with my sex trafficking victims is… the vulnerability of the victim begins at home. And so anything that we can do to continue to strengthen families and provide more support for our families, especially families that might be more subject to just whether it’s financial difficulties or if they’re immigrants, coming here and being, um, ostracized because they don’t necessarily fit in right away. Like, looking at those problems and trying to address it from the very beginning before it even gets to the point where the victim becomes vulnerable enough to leave the home and, you know, have to feel like they need to go into the sex industry. So whatever can strength the family unit (Participant 0052).

And at least there’s a study out there now that shows how this state has dealt with repeat runaways, right? I mentioned that at the training, incarcerating them rather than giving them non-criminal assessments… Now there’s programs that are being talked about, and hopefully implemented soon, about giving these kids civil assessments rather than criminal citations… that don’t end up re- victimizing the kids within the juvenile justice system. Ah, that’s a step in the right direction… Currently we’re trying to get talks with them to be able to require human trafficking assessments. Because nine times out of ten, these kids will be solicited for prostitution, yeah, and trafficked. ‘Cause it’s so lucrative (Participant 0050).

Taken together, the discourses within the Sex/Children/Gender knot often had a more consistent and deliberate feel to them than those in the Labor/Immigration knot. A few of the participants presented clearly articulated arguments that actively engaged in combating competing discourses, such as in the example above related to “survival sex.” Here another participant, who seems aware of the debate over prostitution in the larger society, purposefully engaged in that debate:

The last thing I think that we need to do is just say prostitution is okay and not criminalize anybody at all. I think that (emphasis) leads to problems like what they’re seeing in Amsterdam now, where just the amount of sex trafficking is huge because they basically just gave this façade of a legal business for these traffickers to run their illegal businesses and their underground stuff through (Participant 0054).

The way these participants actively engaged in the meaning making process around prostitution, along with the effectiveness of the “End Demand” slogan, on the whole
gives a picture that local advocates have a coherent and intentional discursive strategy related to constructing sex trafficking. This discursive strategy hinged not on constructing a continuum of abuses, but around constructing the context of prostitution as inherently abusive and corrupting.

**Stage 3: Nomination and predication strategies used in constructing social actors**

The analysis process involved in examining the construction of social actors in the sample interviews was very similar to the process described in the section above. Rather than examining the nomination and predication strategies used to construct phenomena and processes, however, in this stage of analysis social actors were the main focus. Next to each passage analyzed, the nomination strategies for each mention of a social actor was recorded along with the ways in which that social actor was qualified and described (predication strategies). Social actors are essentially the people and groups of people discussed in the text. The analysis found four main categories of important social actors: victims/potential victims, perpetrators/potential perpetrators, helpers, and authorities. As the main focus of this study is centered on understanding how human trafficking is constructed, the two categories of social actors that are of most interest towards that goal are the victims and potential victims and the perpetrators and potential perpetrators.

These categories included groups that are potential victims or perpetrators because often the boundaries between potential/borderline abuses and actual human trafficking were blurred or differently constructed by different participants. Additionally, the nomination strategies used to label groups did not always distinguish between potential victims and perpetrators and actual victims and perpetrators. For
example, some participants used the word “girls” to describe both women in prostitution and women and girls in human trafficking situations:

*Um, so those kinds of places, gonna see- like the Asian massage parlors, they call them AMP’s, and Johns or customers of prostitution will specifically look for those kinds of businesses. So that’s where I see a lot more of the more international girls. Ah, on the streets is a mix of local and mainland girls. I would say that there’s more mainland girls then there is local girls* (Participant 0054).

Other times the subjects of the participants’ descriptions were not specifically labeled and were instead referred to as “people” or “they:"

*You know, when these people came to us, we knew something was wrong. But, like, really knowing kind of what to do and how to help them... You know, our, the practice, my practice has always been getting to the State court and trying to figure out, you know, what was the proper remedy for these people? What can we do?* (Participant 0049).

This passage shows how complicated it is to determine which exact group a participant is referring to when general labels like “people” are used. Here, the participant used the first reference to “these people” to label the potential human trafficking victims that came in for help. The second use of “these people” seems to broadly include the people that might normally come in for help with State court-related issues. Thus, representations of victims and perpetrators were often highly contextual, meaning that a close examination of context is necessary to determine whether the participant considered a particular subject to be an actual victim or perpetrator or whether the subject belonged to some larger group who might be victimized or perpetrate the victimization. With this ambiguity, potential and actual victims and perpetrators were included in the same category in an attempt to understand broadly how these groups were constructed through participant discourses.

**Victims and potential victims.** The relative frequencies of the most common nomination strategies used by participants to refer to victims were tabulated using NVivo software. The initial nomination and predication showed that the words
“victim”, “client”, and “survivor” were often used when discussing issues related to human trafficking victims. A search for each of these terms in their plural and singular forms was conducted for each interview. Additionally, searches for two other labels were included: “worker” and “prostitute.” These labels also occurred with some degree of frequency in the initial nomination and predication analysis. Each of these terms may be used to refer to either victims or to social actors in a larger group of which human trafficking victims are a smaller subset. The results from this quantification of key nomination strategies are provided below in Table 10.

Table 10. Frequency of specific nominations strategies for potential victims**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Survivor</th>
<th>Worker</th>
<th>Prostitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0043 (=)*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044 (L)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045 (S)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046 (=)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047 (S)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048 (L)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049 (L)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050 (S)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052 (S)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053 (L)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054 (S)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058 (L)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059 (=)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The S, L, and = after each participant number represent whether this participant had experience in areas mostly related to sex trafficking (S), mostly related to labor trafficking (L), or both (=).

**Each of these categories includes both singular and plural versions of the word. For example, the victim column includes every use of “victim” along with every use of “victims.”

Table 10 indicates that the most frequently used nomination strategy in all the interviews was the label of “victim.” However, a few participants also seemed to favor either “client” or “survivor”. It should be noted that the interview questions used the label “human trafficking victims” when asking for information about this group of social actors. This may have influenced the participants’ preference of terms.
The terms “worker” and “prostitute” were also used with some frequency. There was a loose general trend indicating that those with more experience with labor trafficking or related phenomena tended to use the word “worker” more often and those with more experience with sex trafficking or related phenomena tended to use the word “prostitute” more often. The initial nomination and predication analysis also indicated frequent use of more general terms, such as “kids” or “women” when referring to victims or potential victims. For example, in the passage below the participant clearly uses “the women” interchangeably with “the survivors.”

*Well, as far as what the women are facing, the survivors facing, their stories stay pretty much the same* (Participant 0054).

Therefore, an additional search for the frequencies of several key general terms was also conducted. Table 11 below indicates the number of times key non-specific labels were used in each interview. Because non-specific labels for sex-trafficking victims were often gendered (girls/women), each gendered label was also paired with its opposite (boys/men) to provide a picture of the trend towards female gendered labels.
Table 11. Frequency of non-specific nomination strategies for potential victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Children/Kids</th>
<th>Teens/Teenagers</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0043 (=)*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044 (L)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045 (S)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046 (=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047 (S)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048 (L)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050 (S)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052 (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054 (S)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058 (L)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059 (=)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The S, L, and = after each participant number represent whether this participant had experience in areas mostly related to sex trafficking (S), mostly related to labor trafficking (L), or both (=).

** Each of these categories includes both singular and plural versions of the word.

Although the nomination and predication analysis found that these non-specific labels were often used to reference victims of human trafficking, they should not be considered synonymous with “victim.” These labels were also used outside the context of human trafficking victims as in the passage below:

*So the men would go, but the women were very disapproving. I knew that because of what- and, but women would never go to the Korean bar, no way* (Participant 0047).

While not every use of these general labels, such as “women” and “girls,” is referring to a potential victim group, many did, and as such, the Table 11 can provide some indication of general trends in nomination strategies.

One notable trend is that those who specialized in labor/immigration-related issues tended to use gendered labels (16 times total) much less often that those who specialized in sex trafficking-related areas (115 times total). As sex trafficking victims

---

10 The total uses of gendered labels for each group (sex or labor) both excluded participants who could be considered non-specialists (represented by the = symbol in Table 11).
tend to be women, it is not surprising that female gender labels are used often while discussing these victims. It is notable that labor trafficking victims tend to be gendered far less often. In fact, one could argue that in Hawai‘i, the two large labor trafficking cases (where potential victims numbered over a hundred), have resulted in the identification of far more male potential human trafficking victims than female. However, use of masculinely gendered terms was relatively infrequent in these interviews. This provides support of the observation discussed above suggesting that an implicit discourse on gender is often tangled with discourses on human trafficking. Where gender is identified, victims are far more likely to receive female rather than male gender labels despite the high number of males that have been classified as human trafficking victims.

Another notable general trend occurred in the relative frequencies of terms used to label children or teens. Like the gendered labels, these terms were not used exclusively to label victims of human trafficking. Occasionally they were used to label the children of immigrant workers and in other similarly neutral ways. However, that these labels are also far more prevalent in the interviews with those involved in sex-trafficking related work (77 times verses 14 times),\textsuperscript{11} provides support for a primary knot between discourses on sex and children.

While the Tables 10 and 11 do indicate some general patterns in the variation of nomination practices across participants, it cannot show the great variety of specific labels that were used to describe victims and potential victims of human trafficking. A list of the variety of nomination strategies used to describe this group of social actors is indicated in Table 12. The nomination strategies in this table are roughly categorized

\textsuperscript{11} These totals exclude participants who were non-specialists (i.e., could not firmly be considered more experienced in sex trafficking or labor trafficking related practices).
under the two major discursive knots. Labels that referred to immigrant victims of sex trafficking were included in the Sex/Children/Gender knot rather than the Labor/Immigration knot. This list provides further support for the prominence of age-related and gendered labels within the Sex/Children/Gender knot.

Table 12. List of nomination strategies for victims and potential victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/Children/Gender knot</th>
<th>Labor/Immigration knot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>H1-V workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young girls</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children</td>
<td>Contract workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids</td>
<td>Indentured workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>Witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex slaves</td>
<td>People who have been victimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>Immigrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom (in prostitution system)</td>
<td>Illegal workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail order brides</td>
<td>Guys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school students</td>
<td>Undocumented Latinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>Micronesian workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women from Asia</td>
<td>Potential victims of human trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean women</td>
<td>Labor trafficking victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young kids</td>
<td>International victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Plantation workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Foreign workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens</td>
<td>Immigrant victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of women being trafficked</td>
<td>Certified trafficking victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex trafficking victims</td>
<td>Pre-certified clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child victims</td>
<td>Former trafficking victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult victims</td>
<td>Female labor trafficking victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk victims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex trafficking survivors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic trafficking victims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining the predication strategies used to qualify and describe these various labels another general trend can be identified. When social actors falling into the large category of victims/potential victims are discussed, much of the time they are
constructed as passive social actors. This group is commonly framed as a group to whom things are done. Below are two examples of this common passive construction:

*I know women whose lives have been ruined just by being in prostitution for a couple of days. I know women’s lives who have been ruined and they’ve been in it for 30 or 40 years. Um, it is absolutely not a victimless crime. It’s horrible. Its deadly. It’s- it just can kill them physically, emotionally, spiritually, mentally, everything. It’s just- it’s so awful* (Participant 0054).

*And then sometimes the, um, perpetrators in, um, cases of DV, or where there’s trafficking are really, um, smart at using the person’s status as a manipulator, to threaten or coerce or leverage them so they can say, um, you know, “If you tell anybody what’s going on or if you go to the police or if you even if you go to the county or to a private attorney for help with this, I will have you deported”* (Participant 0048).

In these passages victims’ lives *have been* ruined; they *are being* killed physically, emotionally, etc; they *are coerced*; and perpetrators threaten to *have them* deported. In these and many other instances, members of the victims and potential victims group are the passive objects of sentences, rather than the active subjects. They are seldom described as doing or acting. Perhaps this is natural because in many circumstances wrongs have been committed against them. However, when this trend is examined critically in the context of a discourse on consent it becomes clear that this habitual way of describing victims often plays a key role in discursive struggles between competing discourses of consent.

When social actors are constructed in ways that minimize their agency it can result in passive and overly simplistic constructions of victims that do not always match the reality of the situation. This kind of construction fails to acknowledge the many ways in which immigrant workers often make reasoned and knowing sacrifices in the face of harsh circumstances. The following passage illustrates the complicated way in which immigrant workers can be *both* exploited and can have a degree of agency in choosing that situation because they may profit in some ways from their exploitative circumstances:
Then, you know, they shared with me how they were forced to stay in their home, forced not to leave the area except for work. I’m told about how they’re not even able to read their newspaper, how, you know, all these directives, basically, “you can’t do this,” “you can’t do that.” You know, they were, they’re lives were dictated by how the business owners, property owners wanted them to… I remember one of ‘em asking, “Well, what’s gonna happen to (pause) my boss?” You know, “what happens if, you know, he’s found guilty?” And I told him, I said, “They’re gonna have- be punished.” And he said, “They’re gonna be sent to jail?” I said, “yeah! (emphasis)” You know, and I told him, “Some of ‘em very long time (laughing as emphasis)” You know? And, again, that scared them off. You know? They go, “Well, we- we don’t…” You know, they just don’t wanna see that thing happening to the person, basically, who brought ‘em in, but have also give them some opportunities. You know, when you look at it that way, they see it as having had some opportunities, ’cause they were able to work, they brought families in, I mean, they describe to me how they were given the resources to bring members in across the border (Participant 0044).

This passage challenges a one-dimensional characterization of victims and a simplistic view of consent.

Similarly complicated tensions between consent and agency occur within the Sex/Children/Gender knot. The following passage illustrates a construction of potential victims that hints at the possibility of agency:

And sometimes- how do I explain this without sounding like a victim bashing thing? But what happens is sometimes when you [are] dealing with young people, and they say- when they talk to parent, they’ll say one thing, when they talking to somebody else, say, “That’s not how it happened, I gotta tell mom that.” So then you got this kind of; uh, drama, but that’s the nature of dealing with young people. Sometimes they have to tell lies to be able to make everybody happy [Participant 0046].

The tension between a social actors’ status as victim and a construction that implies she/he is an agent with goals and agendas of her/his own can be seen clearly in this passage. The participant seemed a bit uncomfortable implying that teens may have some agency in their dealings with boyfriends, parents, and the legal system. The worry is that implying agency may sound like “victim bashing.” This tension is truly complicated because often discourses on agency and consent are used to deny victimization, to blame victims, and to deny the existence of exploitation.

While there is a very real danger that discourses of consent can be used to deny exploitation, constructing victims as lacking the ability to legitimately consent also
risks missing the fact that victims are often complex individuals with vibrant wills and agendas of their own. One participant described a victim who clearly had a will and an agenda that was not in line with what her helpers assumed:

*And so sometimes, you know, we get, like, a girl who’s been in the game for a really long time or say she’s– she’s– she was a bottom. She’ll chew up some of our advocates and spit them out… Um, and just because she was smart enough to see that they were trying to impose their paradigm on her or being, you know, discriminatory or condescending or whatever, whatever pissed her off. And she would just throw it back at them and just cripple ‘em, cut their legs off so they would be out of the picture so she didn’t have to deal with them (Participant 0050).*

As can be seen in this passage, there is a real danger in oversimplifying victims. This danger is heightened within human trafficking discourses because so few victims participate in discussions about human trafficking. Too often their situations, preferences, needs, and thoughts are communicated to the media, to academia, and to policymakers through others, such as service providers and advocates.

**Perpetrators and potential perpetrators.** As with the potential victims category of social actors, common labels for perpetrators and potential perpetrators were identified after the initial nomination and predication analysis. Though there was variation in the nomination strategies that were identified, the five most common labels for potential perpetrators were “trafficker”, “perpetrator”, “employer”, “pimp” and “john.” NVivo qualitative software was used to search for the number of times each of these labels (in singular or plural form) was used in each interview. The results are presented in Table 13 below.
Table 13. Frequency of select nomination strategies for potential perpetrators of human trafficking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Trafficker</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Pimp</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0043 (=)*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045 (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046 (=)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047 (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049 (L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050 (S)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052 (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053 (L)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054 (S)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058 (L)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059 (=)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The S, L, and = after each participant number represent whether this participant had experience in areas mostly related to sex trafficking (S), mostly related to labor trafficking (L), or both (=).

**Each of these categories includes both singular and plural versions of the word.

When Table 13 is compared with Table 10 above (which lists the frequency of the labels of “victim”, “client” and “survivor”) an important trend is apparent. Compared to the number of times victim-related labels are used, perpetrator-related labels are far less frequently used. Table 14 lists the variety of nomination strategies used to label perpetrators and potential perpetrators within each discursive knot.

Table 14. List of nomination strategies for perpetrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/Children/Gender knot</th>
<th>Labor/Immigration knot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Traffickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffickers</td>
<td>Families that are trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimps</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers of prostitution</td>
<td>Recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth talkers</td>
<td>Business owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazed pimp</td>
<td>Boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrong people</td>
<td>Those farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriends (who are pimps)</td>
<td>They</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignitaries</td>
<td>The guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High end of authority officials</td>
<td>Person who is actually perpetrating it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians, cops, prosecutors</td>
<td>Big agribusiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamasan</td>
<td>The person that’s abusing them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys (pimps)</td>
<td>Alleged traffickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tricks</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals</td>
<td>Criminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The business community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A second trend is also apparent. Not only are the most common specific labels (trafficker, perpetrator, etc) used less often in the case of perpetrators than in the case of victims, but Table 14 indicates that there is also far less variety in the nomination strategies for the perpetrator category. Both of these trends point to the fact that perpetrators were not discussed as often in the interviews as were victims.

As discussed above, victims were often constructed as the passive recipients of the actions of others. It is the perpetrators and potential perpetrators that are the implied “others” who act to abuse, constrain, or exploit the victims. However, these perpetrators are very seldom actually named. Rather, in many instances the actions are constructed via subject-less passive verb sentences. For example, one participant discussed trafficking as “a situation where people’s access is so tightly controlled” (Participant 0049). Here access is controlled, but the one(s) controlling the action is not named. In other instances, a subject is present in a sentence, but is labeled vaguely. In these instances it is “people” or “they” who are the actors:

…prevent it from happening to start with, so that means like, even from a labor area where you might just be stepping across the line thinking, “Hey, you know what? These people don’t have jobs. I brought ‘em over. Um, they cannot do just do anything they want!” And so then you somehow think that this is like a contract. So sometimes you might be– get a little more a– we’ve heard, “Oh, here’s the Matson container, and here’s the outhouse over here.” And some people, you know, so they thinking they’re doing better than they would’ve had someplace else, but it might be a form of human trafficking, labor trafficking. It’s the conditions, the fact that you’re not paying minimum wage, or you’re not paid the kinda wage you’re supposed to be paid, but the person who is actually perpetrating it– might think, “Hey I’m helping them, better than what they would have there.”

In this passage, the employers are not mentioned, but “you” might just “be stepping across the line” and “some people” think they are helping immigrant laborers by giving them a job. Here employers or landowners are not named, but their actions and even a potential interpretation of their actions are present.
Together these trends in nomination strategies, or rather lack thereof, do the linguistic work of obscuring the groups of people who are responsible for trafficking and trafficking-related practices. Like with the category of potential victims, social actors in the category of potential perpetrators are rarely one-dimensional. Of course, not every employer is a trafficker and there are many shades and nuances of exploitation (including none) that could be attached to the group of social actors labeled as employers. However, that the label employer is seldom used to discuss the exploitation of trafficking victims has the effect of separating this kind of trafficking from the labor system and from the people in that system that have the most power: employers and landowners.

When the predication strategies for the perpetrators category were analyzed in detail a clear construction emerged that is complementary to the one discussed above with regard to victims. Whereas victims were constructed in largely passive terms, the perpetrators and potential perpetrators were constructed as active agents with clear purpose and intent. In fact, often perpetrators were constructed as highly intelligent, goal-oriented, and “sophisticated” (Participant 0053):

*And, you know, pimps are smart. And people who do trafficking, they’re not like stupid people. They know the law. They know the difficulties about it. They know what to say to people so that they don’t talk. And I think it just makes our job a little bit harder trying to figure out how we’re really going to successfully prosecute and stop something like this* (Participant 0043).

*Traffickers typically like to separate the victim from any potential relationships that they have, so from family, from friends, that kind of stuff. So they really want to isolate the victim, so that is a common tactic, is to figure out a way to isolate the victim. One of the easiest ways is to move them off island.*

*So what’s going on right now … since the Aloun Farm case scared a lot of the traffickers, they resorted to sharecropping tactics to placate these labor traffic victims to keep them from going to the authorities. So it looks to them that they’re getting a piece of the pie, but they’re really not… Which is a brilliant scheme that we invented as Americans that have been picked up by these traffickers coming from out of the country, so, um, and it’s all wrapped within our agricultural industry* (Participant 0050).
The few instances in which perpetrators occurred as passive objects in a sentence almost exclusively referred to instances in which they were being investigated, punished, or prosecuted. In general, though, individuals and groups in the perpetrator and potential perpetrator category of social actors were constructed as having strong goals and preferences and as having conscious strategies and actions to achieve those goals. The victims and potential victims (largely constructed as immigrants, women, and children), were rarely constructed with these qualities and were by comparison seen as far less powerful. The power of the perpetrator group is underscored by their ability to remain nameless in much of the discourse regarding their actions.
Chapter 5: Results II (Supplemental Information)

The Critical Discourse Analysis presented in Results Section I was supplemented with two additional analyses. Congruent with the recommendations of the Discourse Historical Approach to CDA, these additional analyses provide triangulation with the data above to support and expand the key findings. The first supplemental analysis was conducted by analyzing the participant interviews using traditional qualitative analysis techniques. Phenomenological analysis, as discussed in Corbin & Strauss (2008), was used to analyze the main themes and subthemes within the interviews. This analysis allowed for an accounting of the content expressed by the participants, whereas the CDA analysis mainly focused on how this content was expressed. The phenomenological analysis provided an additional layer of within-text context to the CDA analysis.

A second supplemental analysis was conducted to review local newspaper articles. Newspaper articles discussing human trafficking were located in 4 local news outlets: The Honolulu Star Advertiser, The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, The Honolulu Advertiser, and the Honolulu Civil Beat news blog. Each article found using the search phrase “human trafficking” was logged and coded for general content, key words, and coverage of potential key discursive events, such as court cases or legislation related to human trafficking. The news article analysis provides information on trends in nomination strategies used in the media and on key local discursive events (events are events that are prominent in the spheres of media and political discourse and are often important in shaping discourses). The results of each of these supplemental analyses will be presented separately below.
Phenomenological Analysis

In order to provide information back to the participants in the study, a full phenomenological analysis of the content in the interviews was conducted. This analysis focused on the content of the information provided by participants. First, four main a priori categories were used to code each interview using Nvivo qualitative software. These categories were based on the question structure of the interviews and sorted the content into: 1) the challenges of addressing human trafficking in Hawai‘i; 1) changes participants have noticed in how human trafficking is addressed in Hawai‘i; 3) participant opinions about the best way to help human trafficking victims and 4) participant opinions about the best way to prevent human trafficking.

After this initial a priori coding, each of the four major categories (Challenges, Changes, Helping, and Prevention) was analyzed to develop themes and subthemes based on participant responses. For the purposes of triangulation with the CDA analysis, only a portion of these results will be discussed here. In order to focus the results of the phenomenological analysis on information related to the CDA analysis presented above, two main questions were used to sensitize that analysis to issues of power and discursive construction:

1) Do the participants discuss challenges related to the definition of human trafficking?

2) Do the participants bring up issues related to power when discussing how human trafficking is addressed in the islands?

Question 1 addresses whether the participants themselves perceive confusion or conflict over the definition of human trafficking. Question 2 addresses whether the participants themselves perceive issues of power that impact human trafficking. Each of
these questions addresses an important aspect of CDA. The conflicting definitions of
human trafficking, if perceived by participants, provide support for the importance of
understanding competing discourses when attempting to expand awareness of the issue.
Similarly, as CDA proposes that power interests play an important role in the
reproduction and prominence of some discourses over others, participant perception of
issues related to power can inform conclusions about the role power plays in human
trafficking discourses in Hawai‘i.

In fact, issues of both definition and power did emerge fairly prominently in the
analysis of the descriptions participants gave regarding the challenges they face in
addressing human trafficking. Three subthemes were identified within the Challenges
category: 1) definitional challenges; 2) some level of acceptance of trafficking-related
practices; and 3) challenges related to the perception that “it doesn’t happen here.”
Together these subtypes of challenges were identified as barriers to finding human
trafficking victims and addressing human trafficking both on particular neighbor islands
and in the state in general. Participant views of each of these three related challenges
will be presented to supplement the CDA analysis.

**Definitional issues.** Ten out of the thirteen participants spontaneously
identified challenges they faced related to competing or faulty understandings of human
trafficking. The following groups were identified by one or more participants in
relation to not knowing or understanding the definition of human trafficking: parents,
victims, law enforcement, the general public, service providers in the community, and
employers/landowners.
Several participants discussed issues and challenges related to confusion over what constitutes human trafficking. In fact, two participants discussed challenges related to how they themselves did not know what human trafficking was initially:

But nobody there had any experience with human trafficking. We had no idea really what, you know, even to call it human trafficking at the time, you know, we didn’t (Participant 0049).

Less resources but still awareness like I said I’ve been in this field for, close to 10 years and even though I hear the phrase, it was hard for me to identify what it is (Participant 0045).

These participants implied that knowing how to identify and label human trafficking properly is important to addressing the issue.

However, hearing the phrase does not seem to be sufficient to proper identification of human trafficking. Another participant discussed experience with providing education about human trafficking:

And then aside from those who of us who are practitioners and police and stuff like that- but as far as the more general public, I think trafficking is a hard thing because of the language. Like, even the term of our “trafficking” is confusing for people. They’re like, “Well, what does that mean…” Like trafficking sounds like you’re moving something from one place to another- which is part of it, but there’s also an element of it, you know, against a person’s will. And then people are thinking, “Well how does that happen?” Because they’re not immigrants themselves, so they don’t understand how somebody could be told, “You have to work here” or “You have to do this thing sexually.” And people are like, “Well why don’t they just say “no” or why don’t they just leave?” Those are options for citizens but they’re not options for- for some other people. And so it’s a hard thing for people to wrap their minds around (Participant 0048).

Here the participant discussed the observation that both the label of “trafficking” and the phenomenon of trafficking with immigrant victims are hard for the general public to understand. This passage was discussed above in the CDA analysis with regard to the discourse strand of consent. As will be discussed in more detail below, conflicts and variation in how people define or understand human trafficking often involve explicit or implicit understandings of consent. In this passage, “people” have a hard time understanding human trafficking because they do not understand the subtle ways in which immigrants can be coerced into labor or sex trafficking situations.
That people associate the word “trafficking” with movement and, therefore, have misconceptions of what trafficking is, resonates with observations discussed in the Literature Review section. This explicit acknowledgement of the importance of language and labels signals that there is some level of awareness about the power of discourse as it relates to how stakeholders and the public understand human trafficking. Other participants also explicitly acknowledged the power of language to shape understandings of human trafficking:

And the more they [other social service agencies] use the terms “child prostitute”, “independent child prostitute”, and “survival sex”, IN (emphasis) forums such as the legislature or public hearings, it gives the public a completely different view that perpetuates the sexist and racist paradigm that ensnares these kids, you know, and makes them do what they— you know, re-exploits them… And it also relegates them back into a “blame the victim” paradigm, where they’re choosing their own exploitation and the Johns are giving them money, uh- i.e. like some sort of sustenance that they can’t get anywhere else, so therefore needed, just complete bullshit (Participant 0050).

This participant explicitly acknowledged the misconceptions that can be perpetuated by using certain language and labels to describe victims of human trafficking. Here the term “survival sex” is particularly problematic in the participant’s view because it implies that Johns are helping children survive by giving them money for sex. This passage also highlights how this participant understands language to have the power to perpetuate a sexist and racist paradigm.

Another instance in which competing definitions of human trafficking was an explicit topic of conversation is illustrated below. In this passage the participant emphasizes the “emotive” power of the label “human trafficking,” calling it a “bomb name:"

So it’s really how you define it and how strident you are about it. And it’s-- everything is on a range. That’s what I’m trying to express that. And so if you have a broader view of the range rather than just throwing bomb name out there, “Human Trafficking”, everybody goes, “Oh my gosh, we gotta stop that!” People might say, “Oh, labor trafficking, wait a minute.” Like, you know, that Sao Farms that— where they charged them for the labor trafficking and that case was
dismissed. And that was an embarrassment to the Federal Government. And in a way creates, like, you know, in the victims, which many times they do, it’s like, “Ha! That was best thing! Why you trying to prosecute them? You know, we weren’t forced to do anything, da dadada.” (high pitched, mimicking) So it’s- what they did was wrong under certain circumstances and they- so people have to understand that the buzz has a certain emotive response but the range of activities are broad and some would be more tolerated and some less tolerated (Participant 0046).

This participant expressed a view that while the label of “human trafficking” is powerful, in reality there is a range of human trafficking definitions that one can be more or less strident about. Towards the end of the passage it becomes evident that competing discourses on consent can interact to contribute to these more or less strident definitions. Here the participant uses the voices of the victims in a particular case to imply their consent to the situation for which their employers were prosecuted. The implication is that the prosecutors had a different (more strident) definition of human trafficking than the victims and perhaps even than the public, who may tolerate some activities in the range of human trafficking definitions more than others.

Together these and similar passages discussing confusion or conflict over the definition of human trafficking give the picture that participants are aware of competing discourses on human trafficking and that they actively participate in creating and shaping discursive meanings around the definition of human trafficking. Far from concrete and straightforward, human trafficking seems to be acknowledged as a phenomenon that is debatable:

*Well, sometimes we believe that for certain victims, it is trafficking victim, and they [law enforcement] disagree with us. You know, essentially it’s a matter of identification. There’s different standards for each agency* (Participant 0053).

Furthermore, the confusion and conflict over the debatable nature of human trafficking was often identified as a challenge that service providers face in addressing the problem:

*Well, one of the biggest challenges I think… well, there’s a bunch, combating the social stigma surrounding the victims. To keep them- prevent the public from viewing them as, if they’re sex*
trafficked victims, prostitutes, and if they’re labor trafficked, uh, illegal aliens. Umm, that’s a challenge (Participant 0050).

While the participants may not label these challenges as discursive struggles over meaning, they certainly do perceive these struggles over meaning to create real challenges in their work.

Some level of acceptance of trafficking-related practices. Issues of power that influenced human trafficking efforts were also acknowledged by several of the participants. However, observations or concern over power were not always explicit. In several instances participants discussed concerns and observations that there was a certain level of acceptance within some segments of the community of human trafficking-related practices (such as labor abuse, prostitution, or domestic violence).

While these were often not explicit discussions of power, examining participants’ thoughts regarding the acceptance of certain trafficking-related practices can indicate areas in which power interests might be influencing the discursive constructions of these practices. One of the passages cited above is very clear that within the definition of human trafficking “the range of activities are broad and some would be more tolerated and some less tolerated” (Participant 0046). If this is true, it is important to understand what practices may be more tolerated and why. Who benefits from discourses that minimize the extent or severity of trafficking-related practices? Who benefits when these practices are tolerated? Trafficking-related practices that experience a level of acceptance by some segments of the community were identified in both the discursive knots of Labor/Immigration and Sex/Children/Gender.

In the Sex/Children/Gender knot several participants discussed the acceptance of prostitution in society and linked this to challenges in addressing human trafficking:
And awareness in the public and I feel awareness within law enforcement is still a little bit lacking on how to identify all of those areas, or just the depth of the problem that we have. Um, even though it’s an island somehow a lot of our community is still able to turn a blind eye to what’s going on. And it’s not really seen (Participant 0054).

And, some people are still shocked to hear that human trafficking is actually going on in Hawai‘i. Or making the connection that, like, prostitution isn’t just, like, women who are choosing to do it but that there’s some sort of victimization going on there. That’s still, I think a level of education that needs to continue to take place and to transform our society eyes, in terms of how to view, you know, girls who are on Kuhio Avenue. And it’s not like completely that they’re there just by, you know, their ideal job or dream job (Participant 0052).

These participants see community and societal views that are accepting of prostitution as problematic to addressing human trafficking in that these views allow people to “turn a blind eye” to what is going on.

Other participants tied this acceptance to an unwillingness to address the issue on the part of local authorities:

But it’s so normal or mainstream for men to go to the hostess bars. And I’m talking dignitaries. Like, one of the challenges that we have with that, I feel like even our politicians, our cops, our prosecutors, go to hostess bars. Now whether they participate in the- ‘cause the hostess bars, it’s drink, you buy a girl a drink, she sits at your table, spend time together, that kind of thing. And then there’s the whole behind the scenes prostitution that’s going on. So some of our most, you know, high end of authority officials go to these bars and so it’s really- that’s we don’t talk on Maui about human trafficking (Participant 0047).

So they try to pass legislation for that [stiffer penalties for pimps] and it’s always opposed by the DA’s office over there, which is, you know, just that’s the weird dynamic that I was talking about. Like other [places]…on the mainland, the DAs were the ones that sponsored that legislation. Like, they wanted to be able to impose stiffer penalties. But in Hawai‘i for some reason, they’re the ones that oppose the legislation (Participant 0048).

While these concerns were not present in every participant interview, a handful of participants did express concerns over the willingness of local authorities to address human trafficking. The first passage ties this unwillingness to address the issue to the fact that many powerful local authorities are customers of establishments that might have “behind the scenes” prostitution. Whether these accusations are true or not, they represent a view that those in power have an interest in ignoring or denying human
trafficking practices. According to one participant, local men who have positions of power are particularly active in maintaining their power:

*You know, this year I have been confronted with this good-old-boys network in a bigger more- I feel like the work that the women’s movement has done over the years has sort of drew a tidal wave and the old-boys network is, now they’re just trying to thrash women, right now. And that’s nationally, but I feel a lot right here. (whispering) The police chief, the prosecutors, I’m just like, “oh! I hate them all!”* (Participant 0047).

It would seem that within the Sex/Children/Gender knot, challenges related to acceptance and issues of power that participants identified centered mainly on gender and power and on the resulting acceptance of prostitution. If this is the case, then discourses that minimize the existence of human trafficking or that maximize the ability of women to consent to sex work would be seen as maintaining the power interests of men in the community and gendered power worldwide. This is indeed the view of many anti-prostitution groups.

Concerns about the acceptance of certain trafficking-related practices were also present within the Labor/Immigration knot:

*But, my experience is that those law enforcement don’t realize that at all. They think it’s, especially in Hawai’i, where most of our ancestors were plantation workers. They’re like, “Hey if our grandparents did it, why not?” Well, they weren’t happy and they were exploited too, you know. It’s the labor laws, the changes that happened to the- that continues in the United States during the Civil Rights era that actually got them out of that state so that they could have somewhat rights, to be able to put their kids through college and school whatever. So yeah. Um, law enforcement is not what they’re cracked up to be* (Participant 0050).

*And employers here are like, “Oh, yeah, I can take a person’s passport and hold it to make sure that they do their job” or “I can discriminate against this person because they need this job in order to maintain this visa and they’re not going to say anything to anybody because they’re scared.” So that- we see that happening a little bit more here with some of the big agri-business things or there’s a huge population of undocumented Latinos here …So, um, they get, um, discriminated against in employment because the employer knows that, you know, they need the job and they’re not going to call, you know, the police or Department of Justice to report employment discrimination because they’re afraid that they’ll get busted themselves* (Participant 0048).
Hawai‘i is a relatively small community and often landowners and agricultural businesses can have prominent and powerful positions. One participant listed several large local agribusinesses and hotels that were implicated in committing varying degrees of labor abuse towards their immigrant and migrant employees. Even if authorities are not directly connected to these local businesses, there seems to be some suspicion that employers may have influence over them. Here a participant expresses concerns over the implication that an employee at a social service agency may be tied to accused traffickers:

>You know, like we had some people who were workers, like I had a worker, her sister owned the farm in Kahuku who were employing some of the workers. Whether she was in that, I don’t know. But it has connections. Um, you kinda wonder. Okay, well are they using this information? (Participant 0058).

Thus, it seems that concerns over how employers may be connected to powerful people can be very real in these relatively small island communities.

While not mentioned by every participant, this concern that people in authority are not adequately addressing issues of human trafficking was mentioned by at least one participant on each island:

>Prosecutors, police, police commissions, I mean, we those that’s the opposition that we face is in trying to bring, bring the issue forward (Maui).

>I’d be curious to know what your final report will look like. Um, because then you can share that to, you know, the other agents who agencies, whether it’s the prosecutor’s office, the police, and all that- and let them- so it becomes a learning, awareness for them as well, and like “Whoa, this is happening and we’re not doing anything about it!” So, no I’m grateful that you are doing this, thank you (Hawaii)

They, HPD, told me straight up that they don’t believe labor trafficking exists in Hawai‘i. That was 2 days before the Global Horizons case hit the press globally. Um, and they felt that it was just for the political reasons that the law was implemented. And then also, there’s a prosecutor who’s best friends with one of the traffickers. [INTERVIEWER: the labor?] Yup. So there’s a lot of institutional… [INTERVIEWER: apathy at the very least?] apathy at the very least. Yes, that’s a good way to term it (O‘ahu).
“It doesn’t happen here.” The final subtheme is related to the previous two and centers on an often mentioned concern among participants that some authorities and members of the public believe that human trafficking does not exist in their community. This “disbelief” that human trafficking exists is intimately related to both issues of definition and issues of power. If defined too narrowly, then instances of human trafficking will indeed seem non-existent. Therefore, definitional issues around human trafficking are intimately related to a community’s ability to identify potential instances of trafficking:

But, um, I think that for me it’s discouraging that the- if it’s happening- it’s still the reporting is very low. And that was from the beginning...police would routinely say there are no cases, including the police of Honolulu. And everybody’s going: “Ah, Honolulu must have some.” It takes education, awareness, training and a commitment to say, “You know what? Maybe that case that doesn’t look like human trafficking;...[but it] is (emphasis) really if you define it a certain way” (Participant 0046).

Similarly, if those in power such as police or prosecutors are unwilling to acknowledge trafficking-related practices, then no efforts will be made to locate instances of potential trafficking. This ability of people in power to perpetuate the idea that human trafficking does not happen may be particularly acute on neighbor islands, where access to information and support related to addressing human trafficking is far less available than on O’ahu. This is illustrated in the following exchange:

**PARTICIPANT:**
Yeah. So I think other counties, I think if we send our prosecutor over and he says, “We don’t have this problem on Maui,” then we don’t get any information coming back, right?

**INTERVIEWER:**
Oh, okay. So you think there’s maybe a- some- um, at some level there’s an idea that there’s not that much human trafficking here?

**PARTICIPANT:**
On Maui and other neighbor islands too.

**INTERVIEWER:**
Um, why do you think that is that they’re- they’re just not seeing it or-?
PARTICIPANT:

Or they’re just– ‘Cause they’re not going to look at Korean bars or hostess bars. That’s a challenge. They’re also, the teenagers, they’re just calling them out of control and– I think it’s denial and it could be a willful denial I think. You know, I think they’re in denial. Knowing denial (Participant 0047).

Thus, the issues of definition and issues of power work together to reinforce the idea that trafficking does not happen in these island communities. The challenge of combating this impression that trafficking is not a problem was identified by 11 out of the 13 participants. The following passages illustrate the concern participants had related to this problem:

*Number one: more awareness of its existence, what it is, and more community education, I think. ‘Cause people don’t realize that it exists. You know, when– I remember approaching the prosecutor at one time– when one of the first cases that I, you know– came across my desk. And he was in disbelief, he’s like, “oh, really?” They don’t even realize that– people don’t even realize its existence. So I think if people become aware of it and, you know, you know, they’ll do more efforts in trying to address it or combat it or things like that. But I think we need more awareness (Participant 0044).*

*I think that one of the biggest is that it doesn’t take place in Hawai‘i. And it’s something that happens in Thailand and that it’s something that happens, you know, internationally, but it doesn’t happen here. Um, and then once they find- once they realize like, “Oh! There’s stuff going on here?” Then they– that kind of starts to shake their world a little bit, to kind of build a foundation of like, “Oh, well maybe we should be doing something about this or–.” Yeah, I think that’s probably the biggest (Participant 0052).*

These two participants echo a theme that recurred in several interviews. The idea or belief that human trafficking does not exist in Hawai‘i prevents authorities and “people” from trying to address it or do anything about it. Therefore, awareness of the problem is thought to bring about more willingness to address issues of human trafficking. However, the question then becomes awareness of what? If there are multiple competing definitions of human trafficking in the community, which one should be at the center of increasing awareness? Far from straightforward,
disseminating awareness of human trafficking actually involves choosing from among the competing discourses outlined above.

**Newspaper Analysis**

Articles discussing human trafficking from four separate local newspapers were located and analyzed for the second supplemental analysis. Three of these papers were accessed via University of Hawai’i subscriptions and the fourth was a news weblog. Together the newspaper article search covered a time period from March 1996 to January 2003, but the range of years covered varied between newspapers. Around 2010, two major local newspapers (The Honolulu Star-Bulletin and The Honolulu Advertiser) merged and formed a third: The Honolulu Star-Advertiser. The UH library system had online access to The Honolulu Star-Bulletin from March 1996 to June 2010; to The Honolulu Advertiser from November 2002 to May 2010; and to the newly formed Honolulu Star-Advertiser from June 2010 to the current issue.

In order to access another prominent news outlet, the online news blog The Honolulu Civil Beat (http://www.civilbeat.com/) was also included in the search. As it happens, The Civil Beat was also formed in 2010. Therefore, the merger of the two older papers and the creation of both the Honolulu Star-Advertiser and the Honolulu Civil Beat in 2010 marks two major timeframes, 2002-2010 and 2010-2013, each contributing two news outlets. Table 15 below lists the timeframes of the newspaper search along with the news outlets that were available within each timeframe and the number of relevant articles found. These articles were located using the search term “human trafficking” in either the Proquest search engine, accessed through the University of Hawai’i Library System, or through the Honolulu Civil Beat website.
Table 15. Availability of sources during each timeframe of the newspaper search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Source 1</th>
<th>Source 2</th>
<th>Source 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Honolulu Advertiser n = 33</td>
<td>The Honolulu Civil Beat n = 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>n = 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total, n = 186</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three main research questions guided the newspaper analysis:

1) When human trafficking is discussed in local newspaper articles, what subtypes (labor or sex) are covered and with what frequency?

2) Can important local discursive events be identified by the frequency with which they are covered in the local newspaper articles?

3) Roughly which terms are most frequently used when these articles discuss human trafficking (sex trafficking, labor trafficking, slavery, forced labor, or prostitution)?

Using these questions a coding protocol was developed to document terms and major content of interest in each relevant newspaper article. For each article (N = 186) it was determined and recorded whether the article discussed mostly sex trafficking issues, mostly labor trafficking issues, or mostly both. This coding scheme had to do with the content rather than the nomination strategy, therefore it was common for an article to be coded as being mostly about sex trafficking even if it never used the phrase “sex trafficking.” These content categories were mutually exclusive, meaning that an article could not be coded as being mostly about sex and mostly about labor. The purpose of
this analysis was to determine if there were patterns or changes across time related to whether newspaper articles tended to cover more sex or more labor trafficking issues.

Additionally, each time an article discussed a particular human trafficking case or a bill/law related to human trafficking this was also recorded. A count was made to determine how many articles mentioned either a case or legislation and the names of the cases or bills/laws were recorded. The purpose of this coding scheme was to determine if there were key discursive events that can be located within local media coverage of human trafficking. Recall that Jager & Maier (2009) define discursive events as those that appear “on the discourse planes of politics and the media, intensively and for a prolonged period of time.” These events tend to have some influence on the shape of discourse and can provide important contextual information. Therefore, it is useful to determine if any local events, such as human trafficking cases or legislation, occur with enough frequency in the media to potentially shape discourses around the issue.

Finally, for each article whether or not the article used the following five key nomination strategies was recorded in a Microsoft Excel database: “labor trafficking,” “sex trafficking,” “forced labor,” “slavery,” and “prostitution.” An initial set of nomination strategies were identified based off an examination of the labels most frequently used by participants. However, early in the newspaper analysis after reviewing several articles, the original set of labels was modified. “Forced labor,” “prostitution,” and “slavery” were added when it was observed that not many of the articles used the labels “sex trafficking” or “labor trafficking.” Instead, articles that discussed labor trafficking tended to call it “forced labor,” and articles discussing sex trafficking often also talked about prostitution. These categories were not mutually exclusive, meaning an article could be coded as using more than one of these terms.
Analyzing the frequency of these nomination strategies allows an exploration of whether the content discussed both sex and labor related issues and also whether certain nomination strategies might be more or less favored over time.

This final coding protocol was used to code all relevant articles found using the search parameters described above. Because undergraduate student researchers helped to develop the coding system, an additional analysis of percent agreement across all categories was conducted. Of the 186 articles, 56 (30%) were double-coded to examine the reliability of the coding system. In general, there was very high agreement across all codes. Most codes reflected a 98% agreement between two coders. The highest agreement (100%) was found for the code of whether a newspaper used the phrase “sex trafficking.” The lowest agreement (91%) was found for the code of whether a newspaper mentioned a specific human trafficking case. On the whole, these results suggest a fairly stable and reliable coding system.

**Sex, Labor, or Both?** Figure 14 below indicates the number of articles each year that focused on mainly labor trafficking, mainly sex trafficking, or mainly both.

**Figure 14.** Number of articles discussing mainly labor, mainly sex, or both from 2002-2013
Figure 14 indicates three different trends related to the focus of articles that discuss human trafficking. The first trend occurs between the years of 2002-2005. During this time period, almost half of the articles located (total \( n = 28 \)) focused predominantly on labor trafficking (\( n = 12 \)). Articles focusing on sex trafficking were also present (\( n = 6 \)), as were articles that discussed both forms of trafficking (\( n = 6 \)). The remaining four articles discussed the trafficking of children for adoption and issues involving mail-order brides. There were, in fact, two major labor trafficking cases during this time period. These will be discussed in more detail below.

A second trend occurs between 2005 and 2009, in which a similar number of total articles (\( n = 26 \)) discussing human trafficking were identified. However, the number of articles discussing labor trafficking (\( n = 5 \)) dropped. During this time period articles covering both sex and labor trafficking together predominated (\( n = 13 \)) and articles discussing sex trafficking exclusively remained fairly steady (\( n = 8 \)).

The final trend occurred between the years 2010 and 2013. During this time period, all three categories rose sharply (total \( n = 132 \)). Labor trafficking articles predominated (\( n = 63 \)), at a frequency 12 times higher than the previous time period. These labor-focused articles peaked in 2011 and dropped sharply in 2012 and 2013. As will be discussed below, this coincided with the two large suspected labor trafficking cases that were uncovered between 2010 and 2011. The number of sex trafficking-focused articles during this third timeframe also increased at a rate six times what it was in the previous two timeframes (\( n = 46 \)). In fact, sex trafficking articles appeared to increase steadily beginning in 2008 and reached the highest numbers in 2012 and 2013 (both years, \( n = 13 \)). This gradual increase in sex trafficking articles in recent years is in contrast to the pattern shown with labor trafficking articles, which appeared to spike
sharply around specific cases, and then rapidly declined in frequency in the year or two following the case. Articles related to both labor and sex trafficking also increased \((n = 21)\), but not as drastically as those with a specific focus. It is notable that in recent years (2012 and 2013), sex trafficking articles predominated. As will be discussed below this may be related to recent efforts to pass state-level sex trafficking-related legislation.

**Discursive Events.** The frequency with which specific human trafficking cases or legislation were covered was also graphed according to year. The results, seen in Figure 15, are remarkably similar to those shown in Figure 14, and may point to some noteworthy discursive events. The two spikes in the frequency of articles about cases parallel the two spikes in Figure 15, representing increases in the number of articles about labor trafficking. When the particular cases were recorded and summed according to the year in which they occurred, it becomes clear that articles covering particular labor trafficking cases likely contributed significantly to these spikes.

Figure 15. Number of articles mentioning specific human trafficking cases or legislation from 2002-2013
When specific legal cases or legislation were mentioned in a newspaper article, the names given each case or law/bill were recorded in the database. When these names were reviewed by year, particular trends appeared. Figure 16 shows the frequency of articles mentioning the four major suspected labor trafficking cases that occurred in or near Hawai‘i. Since no one sex trafficking case occurred with any frequency, articles discussing human trafficking that focused on the prosecution of particular pimps were included in a category entitled “cases involving pimps.” Figure 16 indicates that the small spike in labor trafficking articles that occurred in the 2002-2005 time period coincided with a spike in articles that discussed two particular local labor trafficking cases: the Kim Soo Lee and the Lueleni Fetongi Maka cases. The Kim Soo Lee case involved the abuse of Chinese and Vietnamese women at a garment factory on American Samoa and the Lueleni Fetongi Maka case involved the exploitation of Tongan workers on a farm and landscaping business in Nanakuli, O‘ahu.12

Figure 16. Number of articles mentioning select human trafficking cases from 2002-2013

12 Both of these cases have been discussed in national human trafficking literature, particularly in the work of Kevin Bales. They were briefly discussed on page 49 in the Literature Review.
It is interesting to note that the case involving Kim Soo Lee and the Daewoosa Samoa Ltd. Company was actually first reported on March 24, 2001 (Adamski, 2001) in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and was reported on a total of 16 times between that date and February 22, 2003, when it was first reported using the label “human trafficking” (e.g., see Barayuga, 2001a, 2001b, 2003a). These early articles made no reference to “human trafficking” and so did not turn up in the initial article search. Instead, they tended to use labels like “involuntary servitude,” “forced labor,” or “labor exploitation.” These articles were not included in the database because this analysis was centered on the term “human trafficking.” The coverage of the Kim Soo Lee trial that included the use of the label “human trafficking” peaked in 2003 with his trial and conviction in a Federal District Court in Honolulu (Barayuga, 2003b). There were 10 articles total that covered this case using the label “human trafficking.”

Shortly after the Kim Soo Lee trial concluded, both the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser covered the indictment of Lueleni Fetongi Maka on June 12, 2003 (The Associated Press, 2003; Viotti, 2003). According to one article, this case marked the “first time a Hawai’i resident was charged under the federal ‘involuntary servitude’ and ‘forced labor’ statutes” (Viotti, 2003). A total of 7 articles reported on this case from the indictment in 2003 to the sentencing in 2006 (Barayuga, 2006).

While these two cases did result in an increase in local media coverage of human trafficking and seemed to explain the predominance of labor trafficking articles in the first four years of the search frame, their impact was slight compared to the two later labor trafficking cases: the Aloun Farms case and the Global Horizons case.

The Aloun Farms labor trafficking case involved a family-owned farm in Kapolei, O’ahu that was suspected of trafficking-related exploitation of 44 Thai workers.
The case was covered a total of 49 times from 2009 thru 2012. The coverage in both The Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser began shortly after the owners of Aloun Farms were indicted on August 27, 2009 (Anonymous, 2009; Dooley & Wilson, 2009). However, initial coverage was sparse, with only 8 articles from August, 2009 thru September 10, 2010, when a trial date was set. Coverage of the Aloun Farms case then picked up in late September 2010 and remained strong throughout the trial in 2011. This trial coverage included live blog updates on the Civil Beat website, further increasing the attention and coverage of this case. Then on August 4, 2011, the Aloun Farms case made national headlines when the federal judge dismissed the charges (The Associated Press, 2011). This was the result of a mistake on the part of the federal prosecutor, who had wrongly informed the Grand Jury about important facts related to a specific charge. Coverage of the case remained strong during the following few months as the media digested the surprising development. However, mentions of the Aloun Farms case dropped sharply from 32 mentions in 2011 to only 5 in 2012 and 0 in 2013. Altogether, Aloun Farms was mentioned in 50 of the 186 articles located that used the term “human trafficking” somewhere in the article.

Another large human trafficking case gained national headlines around the time that Aloun Farms did: Global Horizons Manpower. The Global Horizons case came in a close second to the Aloun Farms coverage, with 40 mentions out of the 186 articles. Many articles mentioned both cases together as the timeframes for coverage overlapped significantly and the cases had a number of notable parallels. Global Horizon was a labor recruiting company that located and hired foreign laborers for various U.S. companies. The case against them was national, involving several states in which the company operated. The first mention of Global Horizons in the articles was on May 6,
2010, in the Civil Beat news blog. The article discusses Maui Land & Pineapple, a large local agri-business, and its past relationship with the Global Horizons company (Levine, 2010). Then, on September 2, 2010, it was revealed that charges were filed in Honolulu against 6 people tied to the Global Horizons company with several articles shortly after touting the case as the largest human trafficking case in U.S. history (Lin, 2010c; Park, 2010). The number of articles mentioning the Global Horizons case peaked that year in 2010, but reporting of the case remained strong in 2011. In July 2012, the case against Global Horizons was dropped, almost a year after the dismissal of the Aloun Farms case (Daranciang, 2012; Lin, 2012). According to Daranciang (2012), the decision to drop the Global Horizons charges was indeed linked to the failure of the Aloun Farms case: “…in light of the Aloun Farms dismissal, government lawyers reviewed the evidence and conducted an additional investigation of the case. Based on that investigation, they decided to dismiss the case.”

The prominence of both the Aloun Farms and the Global Horizons cases in the articles sampled, as well as the national coverage they both received, are strong indicators that these cases represent discursive events. Both cases likely had some influence on how the general public now understands and constructs human trafficking. In fact, these two cases were mentioned by several of the participants in their interviews for this study. At least 5 participants discussed the Aloun Farms case and 6 discussed the Global Horizons case. A few participants cited the dismissal of the case(s) as a setback in attempts to address human trafficking:

So I think it’s, like, I don’t wanna say it’s a bad press thing, ‘cause I don’t really know anything about the case and I know it’s very difficult to charge cases and I don’t know anything about the victims present, but I think for traffickers, they’re like “Yay!” You know? (Participant 0043).

Ah, my feeling was, was looking at the indictment was that it still could have gone forward on other grounds. And, but they weren’t willing to. And there were actually some bitter feelings
afterwards between the FBI and district attorney’s office and the US attorney’s office here, US attorney’s office in DC. So there was some very bitter feelings by a lot of people. They thought that, um, that the ball was dropped (Participant 0053).

This last participant also indicated an opinion that authorities have now been reluctant to go forward with new potential trafficking cases.

However, other participants indicated that these prominent cases had brought positive attention and publicity to the issue in a new way:

*I think there is just more awareness of the fact that it’s happening. You know, I mean, literally under people’s noses. I mean this situation that was happening here on Maui was not, you know, I mean it was, it was pretty public and then, you know the fact that nobody really knows that it was going on, I think that has changed more just as a result of kind of publicity. You know the whole– the Aloun Farms case got a lot of publicity here and, you know, it’s a lot that makes you really think, “Oh, I’m in Hawai’i and they’re a, you know, family owned farm”* (Participant 0049).

*I think here in Hawai’i, because we had some notable prosecutions for labor trafficking it did affect how people went, “Oh! This is more than just sex trafficking.” You know, or forced sex trafficking, and labor trafficking took the headline. And so you can read a lot of that material like the past five years, Global Horizons and some of these others* (Participant 0046).

Because of the level of coverage these two cases received, it is likely that for better or for worse they have had a strong impact on local understandings of human trafficking. For some members of the public, these cases might have shed light on a new kind of trafficking they had not thought existed in Hawai’i (labor trafficking). For others, that these cases failed may indicate that they were not, in fact, trafficking cases at all.

Neither of the earlier labor trafficking cases was mentioned by participants. Perhaps they were not as prominent in the participants’ observations because too much time had elapsed since those cases. It is also likely, based on the results of this newspaper review, that the magnitude of their impact as a discursive event was much smaller. Local newspapers did not cover either the Kim Soo Lee case or the Lueleni Fetongi Maka case with as much vigor as they did the highly sensational Aloun Farms and Global Horizons cases.
A final set of cases was also reported in the newspaper articles sampled. These were cases that involved the arrest or prosecution of pimps. These kinds of articles were only included in the dataset if they also used the phrase “human trafficking” somewhere in the article. These cases likely represent the best approximation of local media coverage of sex trafficking cases that is available. Each case usually involved one to two defendants and was only mentioned in one or two articles total. The number of articles mentioning these kinds of cases were relatively few ($n = 17$), but the coverage of these types of cases did seem to pick up around 2009, with two articles per year through 2010 and 2011, rising to 4 articles in 2012 and 5 in 2013. In 2013, these pimp-related cases represented the only cases mentioned in articles using the phrase “human trafficking.”

While sex trafficking related cases did not have a strong presence in the media coverage analyzed, their gradual rise could indicate a new trend towards acknowledgment of these cases as human trafficking. Coverage of specific State legislation related to sex trafficking also began to rise in prominence beginning in 2010 ($n = 10$) and 2011 ($n = 10$). Although coverage dropped slightly in 2012 ($n = 4$), it began to pick up again in 2013 ($n = 8$). In 2012 and 2013, articles addressing state legislation represented 20% and 42% respectively, of the total articles on human trafficking.

The first major mention of state-level human trafficking legislation occurred in 2010 and centered on Senate Bill 2045, which proposed to make sex trafficking a felony (Lin, 2010a). The Civil Beat news blog covered this bill several times in 2010, as well as publishing a few other articles that criticized Hawai‘i for lagging behind other states in legislating against human trafficking (Lin, 2010b). However, despite passing both
houses unanimously this bill was strongly opposed by law enforcement and the prosecutor at that time (Lin, 2010a) and was eventually vetoed by then Governor Linda Lingle (Anonymous, 2011a). This coverage marks the first small jump in the number of articles that discussed human trafficking legislation as indicated in Figure 15.

The next year, in 2011, other trafficking-related bills were proposed at the State level. House Bill 576 proposed again to establish sex trafficking as a Class A felony and House Bill 240 proposed to provide witness protection for prostitutes who testify against their pimps (Bernardo, 2011). House Bill 141 outlawed labor trafficking at the state level and House Bill 44 attempted to stiffen solicitation of prostitution penalties (Viotti, 2011). By June 2011, two of these bills passed (HB141 and HB240), becoming the first Hawai’i state laws explicitly addressing human trafficking (Lin, 2011). The coverage and analysis of the legislative process surrounding these bills marks the peak in 2011 of the number of articles discussing specific legislation. Most of these articles addressed sex trafficking laws most specifically, with only a few mentioning the labor statute.

In 2012, several articles explained and reported on a handful of bills that proposed to address sex trafficking-related issues. The most notable one of these bills was titled “Safe Harbor” and addressed minor sex trafficking specifically (Bernardo, 2012; Coffield, 2012). While the number of articles reporting on these bills in 2012 was fewer than the previous two years, it seemed that both news outlets did report on the persistent attempts to pass legislation addressing sex trafficking-related concerns. Both attempts to pass sex trafficking-related legislation and the news coverage of these events continued into 2013, when four bills stiffening penalties for users of prostitution
and increasing help for victims were signed into law by Governor Abercrombie (Lin, 2013; Zoellick, 2013).

While sex trafficking did not experience the sharp spikes in media coverage that labor trafficking did, the ability of advocates to keep sex trafficking as an issue consistently in both the legislature and the media for three straight years represents a significant discursive event. This persistence in keeping sex trafficking in the spotlight may even prove to have longer lasting effects on local discourse than the high intensity, but short lived media coverage of labor trafficking. At least six of the participants specifically mentioned the laws that passed in the State Legislature or discussed general legislative progress as a positive change in recent years. Each participant who spoke about the State legislative changes, was generally unambiguously positive about these changes:

Well, you know up until last year, or the year before we had no law on the books in regards to human trafficking. And the work that they’re doing at the legislature is powerful, just even in terms of educating the community about, you know. ‘Cause the whole language of trafficking and prostitution is so victim-blaming, they sound a lot like domestic violence. So, I don’t know all the details of what work has been going on, but I know it’s important to have the laws on the books to start. You can’t move anywhere unless you’ve got a law on the book. So I’m really grateful that they’re doing that because up until the last year I don’t think they had anything. So it’s a powerful step (Participant 0047).

…like especially with the law that we passed this session, the Act 53 this year, which took away the Johns’ abilities to expunge their records, based on good behavior after 6 months. That was a large, that was, like, a very popular way for them to get away with accountability, or not being held accountable. They don’t have that ability anymore. And that’s, in my point of view, it’s very revolutionary for our justice to do that. So, we’re expecting to see a lot more criminal trials against Johns going to court. We’ll start seeing those results in the next few years. We’re already seeing the results of our bills that we had passed two years ago (Participant 0050).

Nomination Strategies. Out of all 186 articles using the term human trafficking, only 22 used the label “labor trafficking.” More than double this number used the label “forced labor” (n = 47). Based on the coding scheme described above, 80 articles were determined to be mostly about labor trafficking, while an additional 40
articles were about both labor trafficking and sex trafficking. The coding scheme for
the nomination strategies were not mutually exclusive, meaning that articles could be
coded for both “labor trafficking” and “forced labor” if they used both terms. However,
even if the nomination coding scheme was mutually exclusive these two labels would
only account for 69 of the 120 articles that discussed labor trafficking in some way.
This finding supports the observations discussed above with regard to participants
favoring general labels such as “human trafficking” or “trafficking” over more specific
labels, such as “labor trafficking.”

A similar picture is formed when examining the use of “sex trafficking” \( (n = 49) \)
and “prostitution” \( (n = 69) \). However, the articles determined to be mostly about sex
trafficking numbered only 60. When this was combined with the 40 articles determined
to be about both subtypes the total comes to 100. Therefore, it seems that articles that
discussed sex trafficking were fairly likely to use the label prostitution when discussing
the issue (about 70%). While not every article that discussed sex trafficking labeled it as
such, a much higher proportion of articles used the specific label “sex trafficking” \( (n =
49) \) than used the label “labor trafficking” \( (n = 22) \).

The label “slavery” was also included in the search after the initial review of
articles. This label was used 38 times. It is important to note that when coding for the
use of this term in the newspaper articles, all articles referring to the Pacific Alliance to
Stop Slavery agency were not included in the count. This decision was made so that
only articles that consciously use the term “slavery” were included. Of all five terms
that were tracked in the articles, “labor trafficking” was the least used. This is
interesting as articles about labor trafficking accounted for the largest proportion of
total articles.
To examine potential changes over time in the preferred nomination strategies these labels were also totaled by year and charted in Figure 17.

Figure 17. Number of articles that use select discursive strategies from 2002-2013

One trend illustrated in Figure 17 is what appears to be a shift in nomination strategies between the first half of the time frame and the second. In the earlier time frame from 2002-2009, no article mentioned “labor trafficking” despite the occurrence of a spike in labor trafficking coverage around the Kim Soo Lee and Lueleni Fetongi Maka cases. Instead, this spike coincided with a spike in the use of the word “slavery.”

It seems that a differentiation of the terms “sex trafficking” and “labor trafficking” was not very pronounced until 2010, when articles using the phrase “sex trafficking” jumped from 3 to 12 and those using the phrase “labor trafficking” rose from 0 to 6. However, the specific label “forced labor” appears to be used more frequently ($n = 16$ in 2010 and $n = 22$ in 2011) than “labor trafficking” ($n = 6$ in 2010 and $n = 8$ in 2011) through 2011, when it dropped precipitously ($n = 2$).
What is particularly interesting is that in the second half of the time period analyzed a sharp spike and then a sharp drop in the use of the term “slavery” seemed to coincide with the coverage of the Aloun Farms and Global Horizons cases. In fact, all the labels that were coded experienced a sharp spike in 2010. This spike coincided with the beginning of all three major discursive events: the Aloun Farms case, the Global Horizons case, and the introduction of state-level human trafficking legislation. Thus, it is not surprising that all of these labels would be more prominent in the news coverage of human trafficking. It is notable that the use of the word “slavery” dropped sharply in 2011 while all four other labels remained fairly high. This decline was around the time when the Aloun Farms case was dropped. While it is difficult to determine any sort of causation from the limited data that were analyzed, one wonders if newspapers stopped using the word “slavery” in relation to these trafficking cases when Aloun Farms’ status as a “legitimate” human trafficking case became murky.

Together these results show some similar trends to the nomination strategies used by participants, but also some notable differences. Like the participants, the articles analyzed seemed to use the phrase “human trafficking” with more frequency than the specific labels of “sex trafficking” or “labor trafficking.” The use of the label “prostitution” also overlapped frequently with discussions of human trafficking, as they did in the interviews. However, two differences are worth noting. When using specific labels, the newspapers tended to prefer “forced labor” rather than “labor trafficking.” By contrast, “forced labor” was not used at all in any interview. Similarly, while “slavery” was the most prevalent label in the earlier years covered by the newspaper analysis, it was used only twice in the participant interviews.
Chapter 6. Discussion

In the following discussion each of the major research questions will be revisited. The findings from the Critical Discourse Analysis presented in the Results I section will be summarized and organized in such a way that Research Questions 1 (including a & b) and 2 will be addressed more explicitly. The remainder of this section will then focus on Steps 7 and 8 of the procedure outlined by the Discourse Historical Approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, see page 60 above): interpretation and critique (7) and the application of results (8). Issues of interpretation and critique will be addressed throughout the discussion, but will be the specific focus of Research Question 2a (“What are the power and social justice implications of contextualizing or decontextualizing human trafficking from a continuum of abuses?”). Suggestions for the application of these results will be presented in the final subsection addressing Research Question 2b (“What model of human trafficking might be constructed to allow for concrete investigation of human trafficking along a continuum of abuses?”).

**Research Question 1: How do the participants construct human trafficking discursively?**

Altogether the results presented above suggest that there was considerable variation in how participants discursively constructed human trafficking. Depending on a participant’s preferences or area of expertise, the different aspects and phenomena were emphasized or not. In the vast majority of cases when participants were asked how to best prevent human trafficking or help human trafficking victims, each participant would provide answers that addressed the kind of trafficking that was their particular focus. For example, when participants with more experience in the area of sex trafficking were asked these questions they tended to provide suggestions for preventing sex trafficking or helping sex trafficking victims. The same tended to be
true for those with experience in immigration-related matters. When asked questions about prevention or helping victims, these participants offered solutions directed almost entirely towards immigration-related matters, and did not tend to address domestic trafficking issues. There were, of course, a few exceptions to this, but overall this tendency highlights the diversity of phenomena that can be considered human trafficking and the corresponding variability that exists in how the participants discursively constructed “human trafficking.” The discourse strand analysis presented in the first stage of the Results I section provided useful tools for dissecting this variability and will be reviewed below.

Research Question 1a: What other discourse strands intersect with or are entangled in the discourse strand of human trafficking? This study found that six major discourse strands tended to intersect with and be entangled in the discourse strand of human trafficking: immigration, labor, sex, gender, children, and consent. Additionally, these strands were combined with each other in various configurations depending on participant interests and preferences. Therefore, while there was considerable variability to how participants constructed human trafficking, there were also some regularities to their constructions. Each constructed human trafficking largely using this set of six strands.

In addition to the regularity of which discourse strands were present in participant constructions of human trafficking (i.e., the six listed above), there was also a general regularity found in how these strands tended to be combined. Specifically, two major discursive knots were identified that divided “human trafficking” into phenomena related to labor trafficking and phenomena related to sex trafficking. Labor trafficking was constructed largely using the discourse strands of immigration and labor. Sex
trafficking was largely constructed through interactions with and discursive knots between the discourse strands of sex, gender, and children, with a few participants also using the immigration strand to discuss sex trafficking with immigrant women.

This tendency to discursively separate labor and sex trafficking was confirmed in the analysis of their nomination strategies in Stage 2 of the CDA results. When specific labels for the different types of trafficking were employed by participants they tended to be the labels “sex trafficking” or “labor trafficking” rather than ones that would divide phenomena along the lines of domestic/international or adult/children. A similar pattern was also found in the analysis of local newspaper articles, in which the majority (n = 146) of articles described either sex trafficking or labor trafficking. Articles that described both of these categories (n = 40) were not as common.

Phenomena related to labor trafficking tended to be described within passages in which the discourse strands of immigration and labor were highly tangled, thus forming the first major discursive knot constitutive of human trafficking: the Labor/Immigration/Human Trafficking knot. As one might expect, issues of labor and immigration were prominent when participants discussed labor trafficking. As discussed in Stage 2 (the analysis of nomination and predication strategies related to phenomena) of the CDA analysis, other phenomena that were discussed within the Labor/Immigration knot included plantation era migrant labor, current foreign labor practices, and issues pertaining to the U.S. immigration and agricultural systems.

Phenomena related to sex trafficking tended to be described within passages in which the sex discourse strand was entangled with either or both the gender and children discourse strands. These various entanglements represent the second major discursive knot constitutive of human trafficking: the Sex/Children/Gender/Human
Trafficking knot. This second knot is more variable than the first, with participants tending to emphasize the children strand, the gender strand, or both to varying degrees. An additional minor variant also included a knot between the sex, gender, and immigration strands. Phenomena that were discussed at the intersections of these various strands included sex trafficking, prostitution, domestic minor trafficking, and Korean hostess bars, as well as issues related to the sex industry and runaway youth.

One of the more interesting and instructive findings of the discourse strand analysis was the importance and prevalence of a discourse strand on consent. This discourse strand was found in combination with both of the major discursive knots to varying degrees in the multiple different constructions of human trafficking that the participants offered. Additionally, within the strand itself there were competing discourses that struggled to conceptualize consent in the context of human trafficking. Often participants offered their own views on consent in contrast to the imagined or supposed views of other people or groups. Some of these discourses, especially those offered by the imaginary others, centered on the ability of potential victims to consent to their circumstances. Further, competing discourses on consent tended to focus on situational factors that might mitigate the ability of victims to meaningfully consent to their circumstances.

Within the Labor/Immigration knot, situational factors related to consent included immigration status, fear of deportation, and poverty, as well as factors that might limit the ability of immigrants to understand what they are agreeing to, such as language or level of education. Within the Sex/Children/Gender knot these situational factors were sometimes related to poverty, but were more often related to lack of family
or other supportive relationships. The lack of these supportive relationships was thought to result in girls and women who are then vulnerable to the advances of a pimp.

Additionally, some participants used a conception of consent that is common in those who take an anti-prostitution view of human trafficking. This is the view that the sex industry is at its core coercive and that those in the sex industry should be considered victims of these inherently coercive practices, not consenting participants. For example, in her report documenting sexual exploitation among Native women in Minnesota, Pierce (2009) writes:

The definition of “victim” is perhaps the most contested and least resolved issue related to sex trafficking and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation. There is considerable controversy as to whether an adult involved in prostitution should ever be considered a trafficking victim. The controversy is directly tied to the argument over whether or not a women or child can ever give informed consent to be purchased and used for another person’s benefit or gratification, without regard to her safety or well-being (p. 23-24).

Discourses on consent that stress these situational limitations to meaningful consent, however, run the risk of minimizing or eliminating the agency of the potential victim groups involved, such as immigrants, teenagers, and women. Denying or minimizing agency in these groups tends to construct them as highly passive without their own goals and agendas. This construction is often out of sync with reality. Issues related to the agency of key groups of social actors involved in human trafficking will be highlighted in the next section. For now, it is important to note again that this tension between agency and consent that plagues the different discourses within the consent
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13 See the examples offered above in the section discussing how the consent discourse strand interacts with both of the major discursive knots.
strand is not easy to resolve. Sullivan (2003), who makes a compelling argument for considering the agency of sex workers, also acknowledges issues of limited consent:

Radical Feminists do offer an important critique of liberal notions of freedom and consent that presume autonomous individuals abstracted from relations of power. In the presence of significant economic, racial and/or gender inequalities, the capacity to practice liberal freedom – to choose and consent – will be severely compromised (p. 76).

**Research Question 1b: What social actors are mentioned in the participants’ discourse on human trafficking and how are they constructed?** The CDA analysis discussed in Stage 3 (the analysis of nomination and predication strategies related to social actors) of the Results I section found that four main categories of social actors were discussed most prominently by participants in relation to human trafficking. These were victims/potential victims, perpetrators/potential perpetrators, helpers, and authorities. For the purpose of understanding how human trafficking is constructed, the two categories of social actors that were the focus of further analysis were the victims/potential victims and the perpetrators/potential perpetrators groups. Because of the variability in the way human trafficking was constructed across participants, as illustrated in Stage 1 and 2 of the CDA analysis, distinctions between victims and potential victims and perpetrators and potential perpetrators were not always clear or consistent across interviews. Therefore, both actual and potential victims and perpetrators were examined together.

Within the Labor/Immigration discursive knot victims and potential victims included mainly immigrants and immigrant workers. When the immigration strand was combined with the sex and/or gender strands, immigrant women consisted of another specific potential victim group. Within the Sex/Children/Gender discursive knot, victims and potential victims included local women and girls, mainland women
and girls, and international women and girls, as well as prostitutes and runaway youth. Results show that in general, victims/potential victims were, in fact, often portrayed in very passive ways. They tended to be the recipients of actions rather than actors themselves and their goals, preferences, and agendas were not often discussed. However, occasionally a passage might offer a different discourse by allowing victims some degree of agency. Immigrants were depicted on several occasions as choosing to work in exploitative conditions to remain in the country or to provide opportunities for their families. A few times victims of sex trafficking were also portrayed as willful actors with the ability to make choices around what kind of help they would like to receive.

That groups of potential victims were largely portrayed passively emphasizes their victimness or their potential to be a victim. This can be seen as part of a discourse on consent. When potential victims are discursively constructed in a way that emphasizes what has been done to them it confirms their need for help. In many ways it is effective to construct victims in this way as it garners sympathy and support from officials and the public, who are much more likely to want to help people who seem like they need help. Perhaps they are also more likely to want to help people who are untainted by complications of possible consent. In other words, those seen as innocent make the most sympathetic victims.

This tactic of creating sympathy through constructing passive victims without agency is, however, deeply flawed on both a practical level and in terms of furthering issues of social justice. On a practical level, this strategy can backfire when and if these overly simplistic constructions breakdown. For example, highly passive and un-consenting constructions of victims are often unrealistic, as the current study has
shown. Therefore, if a more nuanced or complicated understanding of the exploitation becomes public, there may be a reversal of opinion regarding whether the public is willing to grant victim status in light of this new understanding.

In some quarters of public opinion this may, in fact, have happened after the failure of the Aloun Farms and Global Horizons cases. When these cases failed, some segments of the public may have begun to question their legitimacy as human trafficking cases, and also, therefore, the legitimacy of the laborers as victims. Evidence of the turn in public opinion can be seen in two sources of data. While each source alone may have limitations as far as what conclusions can be drawn about them, the triangulation of the two provides more convincing support of this hypothesis connecting the perceived agency of victims and public support.

Evidence of this idea that the failure of first the Aloun Farms, and then the Global Horizons, case resulted in a shift (for at least some members of the public) in the perception of worker consent, and therefore, in perceptions of worker “victimness”, can be seen in an opinion article published in the Honolulu Star Advertiser in 2011 entitled, “Sou Brothers Were the Real Victims” (Anonymous, 2011b). In this article the anonymous author argues for the innocence of the Aloun Farms owners, the Sou brothers, and makes claims about how they have been victimized by the justice system and by the fact that the publicity generated by the trial had damaged their business. Tellingly, one of the arguments the author makes to deny victim status to the workers and place it at the feet of the farm owners is that of worker agency and consent:

All of the recruiters in Thailand charged exorbitant fees.
But the workers were willing to lie to the Thai Department of Labor in Bangkok when asked if they were overcharged, because they knew they could work one year to pay off the fee, and then make the equivalent of a half million dollars in the next two years. Most of the 44
worked abroad before; some twice or more. They weren't poor (Anonymous, 2011b).

Here it is clear that attempts to manipulate victim status and public sympathy are often played out in competing discourses of agency and consent.

A similar construction of victimhood and consent was also seen in one of the participant interviews:

And so if you have a broader view of the range rather than just throwing bomb name out there, “Human Trafficking”, everybody goes, “Oh my gosh, we gotta stop that!” People might say “Oh, labor trafficking, wait a minute.” Like, you know, that Sao Farms that-- they charged them for the labor trafficking and that case was dismissed. And that was an embarrassment to the Federal Government. And in a way creates, like, you know, in the victims, which many times they do, it’s like, “Ha! That was best thing, why you trying to prosecute them? You know, we weren’t forced to do anything, da dadada” (high pitched, mimicking) So it’s- but what they did was wrong under certain circumstances and they- so people have to understand that the buzz has a certain emotive response but the range of activities are broad and some would be more tolerated and some less tolerated (Participant 0046).

In this passage the participant is using the victims’ own voice to construct them as consenting and to minimize their victimness (“we weren’t forced to do anything”). The public is constructed as being outranged by the “bomb name” of “human trafficking,” but pauses when thinking about labor trafficking (“Oh, wait a minute”). The passage concludes with the observations that in the range of activities that may “count” as human trafficking “some would be more tolerated and some less tolerated.” Here again public opinion of victim status seems to hinge on consent and the assertion that workers consented is also tied subtly to the dismissal of the Aloun (Sou) Farms case.

In addition to the concern that removing agency from these potential victim groups can rhetorically backfire if they are discovered to have had some agency in the situation, other authors have discussed the concerning implications this “victim” construction has in terms of the value of social justice. Kempadoo, Sanghera,
Pattanaik (2012) are highly critical of the “victim” construction of migrant women and sex workers:

Victims, who by this definition are passive and child-like, are deemed incapable of undertaking any action, thus requiring “rescue” or “saving” from their circumstances by others who stand outside of the trafficking process and who, it is believed, “know best” (Skrobanek et al. 1997, 18) (p. xxix).

Minimizing agency has the effect of disempowering these groups of women, immigrants, and children. This robs them of their voice and denies their ability to actively pursue a purposeful agenda.

In contrast to the highly passive construction of potential victims groups, potential perpetrator groups were generally described as active, intentional, and intelligent. The category of potential perpetrators included “traffickers,” employers, landowners, business owners, foreign labor recruiters, pimps, johns, and “mamasans.” One surprising finding of the nomination strategy analysis was how rarely this group of social actors was named, especially when compared to victim groups. This (probably not conscious) reluctance to label perpetrator groups likely serves to obscure their identity and keeps victims at the center of the discourse. The effect may be that abuse and exploitation are severed from a systemic context. For example, if labels such as employer and landowner are used to describe perpetrators of employment abuse, then this linguistically emphasizes that these abuses occur in the labor or agricultural systems. When “traffickers” or “people” are the active agents of exploitation, associations with labor or agriculture tend to be obscured.

Not only did participant discourses obscure the groups responsible for exploitation by failing to name them, but in generally characterizing perpetrators as sneaky and clever social actors with high degrees of agency, these discourses perpetuate
the aberrant individual construction of human trafficking. This depiction further disconnects these actors from the context of their actions. If perpetrators are constructed as purposefully abusing the rules of the system, then blame can be placed on the perpetrators. This construction sets up the “system” that is being abused as neutral, when, in fact, it is often highly conducive to exploitation. I call this the “aberrant individual” construction of human trafficking, naming a concept borrowed from others:

From this perspective, abuse of migrants becomes fully the fault of traffickers who must be stopped, not the by-product of exploitive employment practices, restrictive immigration policies, and vast economic disparities between rich and poor nations (Chapkis, 2003, p. 927).

The social justice implications of the various different constructions of human trafficking found in the CDA analysis, including an “aberrant individual” construction are the focus of the next section.

**Question 2: Is human trafficking seen as contextualized in a continuum of systemic abuses or as isolated incidences of aberrant behavior?**

The discussion above highlights one of the main foci of the critical analysis of human trafficking discourse conducted in this study: the continuum of abuses. This idea was most explicitly presented in the work of Chacón (2006), but was also an emphasis in the analysis of human trafficking presented by Brennan (2005, 2008, 2010) and Chapkis (2003):

As trafficking had been linked in the public imagination with child prostitution and sex tourism, it has been decoupled from workplace abuses that may indeed amount to peonage and involuntary servitude. Congress’s failure to discuss the possible expansion of the Thirteenth Amendment and Commerce Clause-based remedies to undocumented migrants cemented the idea that, rather than operating on a continuum, the abuse of laborers fell into two clear camps: virtual or actual enslavement, particularly sexual slavery, and "common" workplace
violations unworthy of substantial new criminal
punishment or victim remedies (Chacón, 2006, p. 24).

Using this concept of a continuum of abuses to critically examine the social justice
implications of the construction of trafficking-related phenomena, participant interviews
were analyzed as part of Stage 2 of the CDA analysis. Again, the results of this analysis
varied between the two discursive knots. A brief summary of the findings related to the
“continuum of abuses” concept for each knot is provided below before turning to
Research Question 2a, which specifically interrogates the power and social justice
implications of these findings.

Under the Labor/Immigration knot the predication strategies used to construct
the various phenomena that were discussed within these two strands were closely
examined with regards to whether they perpetuated a continuum of abuses construction
of human trafficking or whether they obscured this continuum and perpetuated an
aberrant individual construction. Various trafficking-related phenomena were discussed
within these two strands and included immigration, migrant labor, indentured labor,
employment discrimination, and labor trafficking, among others. An attempt was made
to determine if and how these participants discursively located this variety of
phenomena along a continuum of abuses. However, the results of this analysis were
inconclusive. In many instances it was difficult to definitively determine where
participants drew the line between human trafficking and “other” labor abuses. In the
few instances where participants did explicitly discuss the relationship between other
exploitative practices and human trafficking, these constructions were found to vary.
One participant considered all labor abuse to be human trafficking; other participants
discussed phenomena “just close to the edge” of human trafficking, where distinctions
between trafficking and other abuses seemed unclear. Given this variation and lack of
clarity over how participants situate labor trafficking within the range of labor-related practices, it would seem that discourses around labor trafficking might benefit from a more purposeful strategic discursive construction of these phenomena that locates these practices along the continuum of abuses and within a systemic context.

Some participants did, indeed, discursively tie labor trafficking to the contexts of the immigration, foreign labor employment and recruitment, and agricultural systems. However, in discussing how participants constructed these systemic contexts some concerns were raised over how effectively these constructions emphasized a continuum of abuses within these systemic contexts. For example, as discussed above, discourses that suggest better regulation of the system, rather than questioning it, may perpetuate the aberrant individual construction of human trafficking. This is especially so if the need for regulation is characterized as necessary because “people use the system to make their own gains.” Here it seems that the systems itself is not at fault, but the “people” who use it to make their own gains are to blame.

An additional concern was raised around constructions of the U.S. agricultural system’s use of foreign labor that portrayed this system as a necessary evil, using phrases like “the nature” of rural communities and describing the use of foreign labor in the agricultural industry as “a long tradition with our country.” While participants did discuss the exploitation that can happen in this foreign labor system, these kinds of characterizations simultaneously construct that system as “natural” and “traditional,” and, therefore, also unchangeable. On the whole, the discourses on human trafficking found within the participant interviews did situate labor trafficking within the systemic
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14 I find it important to place another reminder here about discourse and individual attitudes and values. It is not my intention to criticize these participants, but rather to highlight our language and how it can habitually and unconsciously reinforce power inequality. I say “we” because an analysis of my habitual ways of speaking could just as easily be the focus of this kind of critical attention.
contexts of current U.S. immigration, foreign labor, and agricultural systems, but did so unevenly and perhaps not very effectively.

Phenomena within the Sex/Children/Gender knot included prostitution, sex trafficking, domestic trafficking, domestic violence and runaway youth, among other things. Similar to the finding within the Labor/Immigration knot, there was not always consistency or clarity about how participants conceptualized the relationship between prostitution and sex trafficking. However, a few participants did clearly equate constructions of prostitution and sex trafficking.

While there may have been some variation in how prostitution was related to sex trafficking across participant interviews, there was very little variation, if any in how participants constructed the systemic context of the sex industry. Rather than constructing sex trafficking as existing in a system in which a range of abuses can occur, or even as the acts of aberrant individuals, participant discourses almost universally constructed the sex industry as inherently corrupt and corrupting. That no interview revealed a strong counter-discourse to the view that the sex industry is a corrupt system that should be abolished suggests that this culturally constructed discourse around paid sex enjoys an almost unquestioned dominance. This view contrasts starkly with discourses found within the labor and immigration strands, which were often found to be the sites of highly contested discursive struggles for dominance. Despite the surface differences in how participants may divide up prostitution and sex trafficking, there was, thus, a strong underlying consistency to their constructions of these phenomena that did not exist within the Labor/Immigration knot.

**Question 2a: What are the power and social justice implications of contextualizing or decontextualizing human trafficking from a continuum of**
abuses? In explicitly examining the power and social justice issues related to the particular discursive constructions discussed in this study, this section seeks to articulate how language in the context of human trafficking “serves to legitimize relations of organized power” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The groups that benefit from these legitimizations can be located at both the local and global levels. As the discourses related to the systemic contexts of labor and sex trafficking were found to be quite different, the power and social justice implications of each will be considered in turn, again presented under the framework of the two major discursive knots.

Within the Labor/Immigration discursive knot certain constructions of human trafficking likely do “legitimize” the power of both local and global interests. One of the concerns discussed above related to the nomination strategies used for the perpetrator/potential perpetrator groups; specifically, the discursive obscuring of the identities of those who exploit immigrant workers, such as employers or landowners. Obscuring the role of employers and landowners tends to serve the interests of this locally powerful group, who can remain detached from the exploitation of their workers. The phenomenological analysis presented in the Results II section showed that participants themselves, in fact, mentioned concerns regarding the power interests of this group.15

The ability of power interests to influence and control the discourse around human trafficking may be even more pronounced on neighbor islands. These small communities are economically reliant on the agricultural industry, giving agricultural businesses and employers a significant amount of power. In this context, it is not

15 And, you know, some businesses don’t have a problem with, you know, hiring people for very low wages, and don’t see it as trafficking. So there’s- and I know that there a lot of people who do not feel that we have a big problem (Participant 0059).
surprising that certain pro-business discourses on labor can emerge, such as the article described above which cast the business owners as the “real victims” and castigated the laborers. A similarly pro-business, pro-agriculture construction was also found in at least one participant interview where labor trafficking was constructed as accidental (“where you might just be stepping across the line”) and even well meaning (“I’m trying to suggest that maybe some of the people are thinking that they helping in the labor area”). These kinds of sympathetic portrayals of employers along with discursive practices that minimize, deny, or decontextualize labor abuses and human trafficking serve local power interests in that they leave employment practices and employers free from unflattering scrutiny and oversight. Thus, these discourses covertly support environments in which employers can have almost unfettered power over employees whose rights are scarcely considered (“they cannot just do anything they want!”).

Additionally, discourses around immigration that are overly exclusionary and perpetuate the “line” metaphor in which immigrants must wait their turn to enter the U.S., also serve to maintain local power differences between citizens and non-citizens. One participant mentioned a “vocal opposition” to immigration reform that was concerned about immigrants taking jobs away from citizens. If immigrants have to dutifully wait in line, then these citizens can rest assured that they will trickle in slowly, allowing citizens to maintain their relative power status. This kind of discourse on immigration further maintains employer power over immigrant workers, who are constructed as having fewer rights to complain about poor labor practices than citizens.

16 So that, in turn, any time there’s more visibility on an issue it creates more of a push back for people who are scared about what it might be, or how it might change, or what jobs might be taken away from people, and stuff like that. So that’s kind of the one of the challenges in the last year or two that I’ve noticed. There’s a lot more visibility, which is good, but there’s a lot more vocal opposition (Participant 0048).
Not only does this serve to maintain local power differences between citizens and non-citizens and between workers and employers, but it also serves to maintain a structure of global power inequity. In order to examine this, I employ the concept of ideology as outlined by Steger (2008). In his *Globalisms*, he uses the following definition: “a system of widely shared ideas, patterned beliefs, guiding norms and values, and lofty ideals accepted as ‘fact’ or ‘truth’ by significant groups in society” (p. 6). These “widely shared” beliefs are often unquestioned assumptions that make their way into our everyday language use. In particular, Steger (2008) examines the ideological claims of what he calls “market globalism.”

As described by Steger (2008), the ideology of market globalism maintains the power interests of both transnational businesses and nations with large capitalist economies. It does this by perpetuating certain understandings about globalization that are accepted as true in large swaths of society. Market globalism as an ideology aligns with the neoliberal ideals of a free and unregulated global economy. These ideals are based in the theory that economic markets follow laws of supply and demand and function best when left alone (Steger, 2008). International migration for labor exists within current trends towards the globalization of world markets. As large transnational companies and global elites in “developed countries” seek to maximize their profits by minimizing labor costs, these groups have increasingly turned to migrants from less developed countries as a source of cheap labor. The dominant ideology of market globalism is, therefore, likely influential in shaping certain discourses on migrant labor and, thus, on human trafficking.

Steger (2008) locates 6 major ideological claims about globalization that are perpetuated and normalized through the discourses of market globalism. For the
purposes of the present study three of these claims will be discussed in relation to discourses on human trafficking: 1) globalization is inevitable and irreversible; 2) nobody is in charge of globalization; 5) globalization benefits everyone.17 These three claims are particularly bolstered by decontextualized constructions of human trafficking, and by extension so is the power of large capitalist nations and transnational corporations whose interests these claims maintain.

If we see globalization, as is the case in the market globalism ideology, as a massive, irreversible, and inevitable force in the modern world (claim #1) (Steger, 2008), then we must see the phenomenon of transnational migrant labor as an equally inevitable product of this globalization. In fact, we might even see transnational migration for work as an essential aspect of a free and unregulated global economy. In a system where labor and production costs are minimized so that profit can be maximized, cheap labor is essential. As discussed above, discourses on migrant labor that tend to construct it as a “necessary evil” perpetuate this ideology through emphasizing the futility of change. In the words of one participant, “I don’t think anybody’s willing to do anything about it.” Ultimately, this creates a kind of reality in which other, more just alternatives, are hard to conceive. When alternatives to these systems are discursively constructed as impossible, then those currently in power maintain their dominance.

The discursive obscuring of the people and systems responsible for creating environments conducive to labor exploitation also maintains dominance of the market globalism ideology by perpetuating the perception that “no one is in charge” of these systems (claim #2) (Steger, 2008). Finally, obscuring the exploitation and abuse that are inherent to a labor system that is constantly seeking to minimize expenses and

17 The remaining three claims of the market globalism ideology as outlined by Steger (2008) include: globalization is about the liberalization and global integration of markets; globalization furthers the spread of democracy; and globalization requires a war on terror.
maximize profit is also necessary to maintaining the market globalism ideological claim that “globalization benefits everyone” (claim #3) (Steger, 2008). That some of the discourses on human trafficking examined in this study support the three claims of market globalism indicates that these discourses are complicit in maintaining the power interests of transnational companies and wealthy nations in the global North. It is interesting to note that American consumers also benefit from these ideological claims. We enjoy the privilege of paying less money for produce when labor costs are minimized and, therefore, we can be considered among those who benefit from maintaining these unjust discursive constructions.

By contrast, the interests of social justice would favor discourses that work to situate and contextualize human trafficking within the range of exploitative practices that are common to current immigration and migrant labor systems. Purposefully using discourses that contextualize human trafficking would be both practically and discursively helpful for advocates. One of the most frequently mentioned challenges discussed within the participant interviews was that authorities and “people” do not believe human trafficking exists in Hawai‘i (see Results Section II). When examined in the context of the discussion presented above, we can see that this is a powerful discursive tool for obscuring exploitative practices.

When considering the results from the phenomenological study, the current discourse seems to be stuck on whether or not human trafficking exists in the Islands. In many instances, when participants discussed their views about “people’s” disbelief regarding the existence of human trafficking, they discursively combated these views with counterarguments about its existence. The effectiveness of this tactic is questionable, however, as even cases that have received “official” attention as potential
human trafficking cases, such as the Tongan pig farmer, Aloun Farms, or Global Horizons, have arguably been easily forgotten or dismissed by the public. A more effective strategy might be to emphasize the range of exploitative practices in target labor industries. This shifts the argument away from whether human trafficking exists or not and suggests instead that it may exist within these industries, but that even if it does not, exploitation certainly does. Additionally, discursively emphasizing the fact that these workers might not, in fact, benefit from market globalization, challenges the dominant ideology around that notion.

The influence of local and global power interests was also the focus of an examination of phenomena within the Sex/Children/Gender knot. In a way similar to that described above in relation to the Labor/Immigration knot, participants expressed concerns that local power interests were also benefiting from a minimization and denial of exploitative practices within this knot. These concerns were discussed in detail in the Results II section, where participants described both general issues related to gender and power in the local context (e.g., the “good old boys network”) and specific issues related to powerful individuals such as police and prosecutors who patron establishments where prostitution is practiced.

In addition to maintaining the status of these local power interests, certain discourses on human trafficking that occur within the Sex/Children/Gender knot may maintain global power interests as well. However, evaluating the power implications of the competing discourses within the Sex/Children/Gender knot is less straightforward than the implications presented above in relation to the Labor/Immigration knot. One reason is because both major discursive constructions related to the context of sex trafficking, the anti-prostitution construction and the sex worker rights construction,
claim to discursively combat unequal power relations. The anti-prostitution
construction of prostitution, described in the Literature Review, was found to be the
discourse that most dominantly affected participant constructions of the sex industry.
To combat what is seen as the oppressive global male domination of women through
objectifying and sexualizing them, this discourse constructs the sex industry as
inherently corrupt rather than a system in which there is a range of exploitative
practices (Sullivan, 2003).

Other discourses provide an alternative to this view, especially that of the sex
worker rights movement (Kempadoo et al., 2012; Sullivan, 2003). This view, which was
not noticeably present in the participant interviews, argues that sex work should be
considered labor and that sex workers should receive the rights and regulations that
laborers in other industries might receive. In the discourse strand framework discussed
above this would be a discursive knot between sex and labor (in many constructions this
knot includes gender and immigration too). This kind of relationship between the
discourse strands of sex and labor was noticeably absent from the participant interviews
analyzed for this study.

In fact, it was scarcely present in the local newspaper articles that were
examined as well. One exception was an article published last year in the Honolulu Star
Advertiser entitled, “Many Sex Workers Not Victims, Want Rights” (Ryan, 2013). In it
Ryan (2013) informs her readers that “there are two sides to this discussion” regarding
the anti-trafficking bills that were frequently in the news at that time (see the discussion
on discursive events in Results Section II). In reference to the lack of awareness about
discourses outside of the anti-prostitution (here “anti-trafficking”) discourse presented
above she writes:
The ability to communicate is uneven. The anti-trafficking groups have access to money from well-heeled Christian groups and from the U.S. government. The government is not in the habit of funding any organizations that oppose their human-trafficking ideas. This creates a gag effect limiting discussion (Ryan, 2013).

Like the sex worker rights movement, which she references, Ms. Ryan argues against creating legal penalties for “adult consensual prostitution.” The results from this study suggest that this construction of prostitution was not present in the local discursive context.

If not locally, then globally the sex worker rights construction of the sex industry represents a discursive challenge to the anti-prostitution discourse. Proponents of this view question the “totalizing” construction of the sex industry as inherently corrupting and in need of eradication (Sullivan, 2003). Additionally, the sex workers’ rights discourse criticizes the Western-centric conceptions of sex and women that they see as inherent to anti-prostitution discourse and emphasizes “different narratives about the meaning of prostitution transactions (Sullivan, 2003, p. 75).

The challenge in evaluating these two views is that each claims that the discourse of the other perpetuates unequal power relationships. For the anti-prostitution view the “different narratives” emphasized by sex workers’ rights groups would be seen as discourses supporting male power and, therefore, in need of critical assessment. However, on the other hand, the sex workers’ rights movement argues that abolitionist discourses privilege Western middle-class power interests by using Western-centric discourses on the meanings of sex and gender to further limit the migration of women, especially women from the global South (Kempadoo et al., 2012). This sex workers’ rights movement takes “a critical stance towards the narratives on
human trafficking that locate migrants and sex workers as victims, advocate a politics of
rescue or call for greater criminalization of human life” (Kempadoo et al., 2012).

As both of these movements attempt to make criticisms of dominant power
structures and the discourses that maintain them, it becomes difficult to navigate a path
towards determining what kinds of discourses within the strands of sex, women, and
children are better in terms of the value of social justice. Certainly exploitation and
abuse is rampant in the sex industry, making it difficult to mount a social justice
oriented discourse against the current construction that it is inherently corrupting,
especially where “children” are involved. Yet, the discussion earlier on the
constructions of consent and agency that result from this view of the sex industry show
that it is also problematic, especially for those who do not share Western cultural views
related to gender, sex, or what constitutes a child.

Rather than throw more fuel on this highly contentious debate, I am choosing
for now to acknowledge that the intention of each discursive construction of the sex
industry and sex trafficking is to combat what they perceive to be the unequal
distribution of power related to either male dominance or Western dominance. In
regards to the local context, however, it seems that anti-prostitution views are almost
entirely unchallenged. It might be important, therefore, to create space for the
consideration of opposing perspectives, especially among immigrant women in the sex
industry. This group may arguably be the most overlooked “potential victim” group
throughout the interviews. While their presence in the Islands was acknowledged by a
few participants, a complete understanding of the perspectives of immigrant women in
the sex industry was noticeably absent.
Regardless of which of these perspectives on the sex industry one might subscribe to, a focus on the context in which sex trafficking and prostitution are situated is still useful. If constructing sex work as a kind of labor, then the “continuum of abuses” concept would be as useful for highlighting the systemic context in the sex industry as it would be in the agricultural industry. In both industries, calling attention to a range of exploitation can help workers advocate for better conditions and refocuses the debate away from which particular practices might be bad enough to “count” as human trafficking. If constructing the sex industry as inherently exploitative, then documenting the range of exploitations seems equally useful.

Beyond the sex industry itself, there are other contexts and systems in which a continuum of abuse construction might point to more social justice-oriented discourses. One such context that was mentioned in the interviews was that of runaway and homeless youth. In exploring and emphasizing the range of abuses and dangers that youth in these contexts face (not just sex trafficking), advocates could create a more holistic picture that includes other, perhaps “lesser,” exploitation that is in need of attention. Contextualizing the lives of runaway and homeless youth in this way would give better voice to the multitude of challenges they face and avoid an overly-simplistic construction of “child sex trafficking victims.” Additional, related systems, such as the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, could also be explored in this way.

Finally, as mentioned above, the group that seemed least often discussed in the participant interviews, was that of immigrant sex workers. The systemic context and range of exploitative practices that these women face is likely different from those that citizens face, and is almost certainly different from what minors in the sex industry face. Additional challenges related to the immigration system could be unique sources of
exploitation for these women. Focusing on a contextual view of human trafficking, therefore, results in unearthing multiple and various systems in which these phenomena could be situated.

**Question 2b: What model of human trafficking might be constructed to allow for concrete investigation of human trafficking along a continuum of abuses?** As discussed briefly above, this study employed a prospective critique to explore local discourses on human trafficking. Prospective critique focuses on possible future discourses and “seeks to contribute to the improvement of communication” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). This section addresses recommendations for shaping possible future discourse on human trafficking using the framework of social justice. Specifically, I recommend a process for talking about, advocating for, and researching human trafficking that is sensitized to the subtle ways in which discourse can perpetuate more just understandings of the phenomena related to human trafficking.

One of the major challenges identified by participants was a general confusion on the part of the public related to just what constitutes human trafficking. Additionally, throughout the academic literature about human trafficking are critiques and complaints about a lack of conceptual clarity in much of the existing research. Thus, there is a need for a clear model for understanding human trafficking. However, one major challenge to achieving this conceptual clarity lies in the diversity of both the phenomena and the discursive constructions of those phenomena that fall within the nominative umbrella of human trafficking. Thus, a definitive and universal model for investigating and addressing “human trafficking” seems elusive, but nonetheless important:

Furthermore, we need a better understanding of the social field that constitutes trafficking, as well as its bordering fields; i.e. is trafficking best understood as a phenomenon within the field of labor migration, international
prostitution, or migration in general, or does trafficking constitute a distinct and separate phenomenon with its separate causes and mechanisms? These questions call for data production and analysis in anthropological and social psychological veins (Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005, p.31).

Therefore, in full acknowledgement of the complicated nature of this challenge and using the results of this study as a guide, the following section proposes a process, rather than a definitive model, for investigating and beginning to address human trafficking. This process places a special emphasis on the value social justice and issues of advocacy. Therefore, those who wish to privilege other factors, such as criminal justice or legal priorities, may wish to follow a different process.

**Conceptually modeling human trafficking.** The first recommendation in the suggested process of modeling human trafficking is establishing a transparent conceptual framework. Several of the academics discussed in the Literature Review have lamented the lack of conceptual clarity plaguing research on human trafficking (Gozdziak & Collett, 2005; Potocky, 2010b; Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). However, as the results of this study have indicated, the framework within which human trafficking lies is highly contested. Therefore, it is unlikely that advocates and researchers will come to full agreement about how to define and operationalize the concept of human trafficking. As a result, any model offered within a specific ideological frame will be of limited use.

However, when researchers and advocates try to rise above or circumvent the ideological struggle that surrounds the human trafficking debate, it is also of limited use because it often lacks the necessary conceptual clarity described above. One product of this study that may be useful to other researchers or practitioners is the development of a relatively simple way of modeling the discursive tensions that can lie within different
approaches to human trafficking. Using the idea of discourse strands and knots, various constructions of human trafficking can be mapped as different combinations of strands with different degrees of entanglement.

While this may seem like a fairly abstract exercise, participants’ own accounts of the difficulties involved with competing definitions of human trafficking would seem to make this a useful tool. This kind of discursive clarity can allow for explicit conceptualization of specific phenomena via a transparent statement of how and to what extent the phenomena is thought to be constructed using the six major discourse strands and the concept of discursive knots. Such a system of describing the conceptual framework of the phenomenon of interest is both flexible enough to include ideological variations, but explicit enough to allow for transparency around how the idea of human trafficking is operationalized.

_The importance of contextualization._ The results of this study clearly show that we should not consider human trafficking a single monolithic phenomenon. As the varying constructions indicate, several diverse phenomena exist under the umbrella of “human trafficking.” These phenomena should not be lumped together. Rather, I recommend that research into the specific local systemic context of each would provide much more useful information to researchers and advocates. Within the nexus of the various overlapping discourses strands involved in constructing the phenomenon of human trafficking, researchers and advocates should seek to identify the broader contexts, such as the family or juvenile justice system, thought to be related to the particular phenomenon of human trafficking that is of interest. For example, one might investigate the context experienced by migrant farm workers in Hawai‘i to better understand both the continuum of abuses that might exist within this system and the
workers’ strategies for navigating this context. This kind of investigation would reveal vastly different processes than an investigation of homeless youth and the continuum of abuses that they might experience, although both might be framed as investigations into these groups’ vulnerability to practices of human trafficking.

Additionally, as discussed above a model that contextualizes the problem within one or more of the systemic contexts of the sex industry, labor practice, immigration, child welfare, gendered power dynamics, etc. is necessary to ensure that research is grounded in the values of social justice. Discourses that are asystemic and stress the unseemly actions of a few aberrant individuals perpetuate existing power inequalities and allow “lesser” abuses to go unnoticed. One way to challenge the idea that human trafficking does not exist in the islands is to map the systemic context in which it could exist and in which other injustices almost certainly do exist. Several of the participants in this study stressed the need for numerical data to justify the existence of human trafficking in Hawai‘i for funding and public awareness purposes. However, developing a system to track survivors of trafficking has proven extremely challenging. Quantifying abuses along a continuum could help advocates establish convincing need for intervention or change without getting stuck in trying to figure out who “counts” as a human trafficking victim.

**Framing the problem around rights rather than consent.** In addition to contextualizing trafficking-related phenomena through discourse and research, this study recommends that local advocates also consider using a stronger “rights” discourse and deemphasizing discourses on consent. While legal definitions of human trafficking are constructed around consent, advocate discourse about human trafficking need not be. If advocates and researchers want to create socially just discourses around
disempowered groups such as immigrants, women, and children, then continuing to use agency-denying discourses that emphasize their passivity and victimhood is counterproductive.

An alternative would be to discursively emphasize the rights of these disempowered groups. Thus, rather than stressing the limited ability of migrant or sex workers to “meaningfully” consent to their situations in order to justify their need for sympathy and help, advocates might do better to stress the rights these groups are entitled to, like the rest of society, including to be paid what they should, to not have to tolerate abusive or exploitative situations, etc. This approach mobilizes a sense of justice rather than a sense of pity and, therefore, maybe a more empowering construction of these “vulnerable groups.” A few participants did mention the rights of these groups, but this formation only occurred in a minority of cases. Because this kind of discourse about rights was not mentioned often, local advocates and researchers may want to consider consciously and explicitly refocusing their language on rights rather than consent.

*The importance of marginalized voices:* It must be acknowledged that rights-based discourses are not without their problems with regards to social justice and power. Discourses around human rights are increasingly being recognized as strongly influenced by Western concepts and values (i.e., individualism) (Kempadoo et al., 2012). The danger that rights-based discourses can also covertly support dominant power structures must be acknowledged:

The legal approach of the UN Protocol to human trafficking is lodged in a criminal justice framework framed within international law that assumes human rights to be transhistorical or “natural,” yet which translates not into the promotion of universal rights, but, as various legal scholars point out, into the
universalization of the liberal Western legal tradition (Kempadoo et al., 2012, p. xvii).

To avoid the danger of imposing inappropriate (or overly Western) conceptions of the rights entitled to by the population of interest, Kempadoo (2012) recommends that researchers and activists work alongside members of these groups. In her case, that means paying careful attention to the voices, preferences, and agendas of migrant women and international sex workers. However, the same principle would apply to domestic minors, sex workers from the mainland, or male migrant workers, etc. Too often advocates and researchers speak for these groups and even advocate for their rights, but their voices are rarely heard (Kempadoo et al., 2012).

One way to engage a more socially just discourse around human trafficking would be to better engage the “victims” and “potential victims” in a dialogue around what kind of rights they wish to be central to the discourses involving them. Thus, if one is interested in creating just discourses around human trafficking, methods such as participatory action research might be the most appropriate for understanding the complexity of these phenomena. This would address the need to bring “victim” voices “to the table.” Such an approach would also challenge the current system in which others speak for them.\(^{18}\)

In order to move toward more deliberate discourses on human trafficking that aim towards more just understandings of the phenomena, I recommend using the process outlined above to clarify and focus research, advocacy, and local discussions of human trafficking. Both researchers and advocates would benefit from more transparency and clarity related to how they operationalize and define human trafficking.

\(^{18}\) An example of this can be seen on page 177 of this paper, where the participant uses the voices of human trafficking victims to deny their exploitation.
trafficking in a particular local context. One way to bring clarity and a more systematically grounded focus to conversations on human trafficking is to situate the various phenomena related to human trafficking within a systemic continuum of abuses. Additionally, I recommend that when talking about or advocating for the need to address human trafficking, researchers and advocates begin to more consciously stress the rights of vulnerable populations within these systemic contexts. Finally, to ensure that this is done in a socially just manner, I recommend that representatives of these vulnerable populations be included in research and advocacy related to human trafficking. In following these four recommendations I believe that researchers and advocates might begin to move toward more clear and deliberate representations of human trafficking that can effectively communicate to the public understandings of human trafficking that are more in line with the principles of social justice.

**Reflections on the use of critical discourse analysis**

Critical discourse analysis is not a method commonly used in community psychology, and, as such, its use in this study represents a novel approach to social and community issues. As with most methods, CDA as a tool for community psychologists has both strengths and limitations. Human trafficking is not unique as an issue that is both a socially constructed understanding of a problem and the focus of intense debate. Other issues such as poverty, homelessness, and inner city violence, are the subjects of multiple competing definitions and explanatory frameworks. Furthermore, discourses around these and many other issues often subtly reinforce the interests of a powerful few. For these reasons, I propose that CDA is an extremely useful tool for both unpacking conceptual disagreements and for understanding issues of power and social justice related to those disagreements. However, CDA is limited in that it is best used
for dissecting the discourses of the powerful rather than emphasizing community voices. At best, this method can attempt, as in the current study, to highlight issues of power that prevent community voices from being heard. It can, therefore, be seen as contributing important conceptual clarity to issues of power in debates surrounding controversial issues that researchers and advocates can then use to better engage the perspectives and views of community members and marginalized groups.

**Local Context**

It must be acknowledged that rather than examining discourses at a national level, this study sought to understand discourses on human trafficking in a specific social, cultural, and historic context, that of Hawai‘i. Other local contexts will likely produce different discourses around both labor and sex trafficking. For instance, several participants mentioned challenges that are unique to the context of Hawai‘i, such as the challenge that undocumented immigrants face in being essentially stuck on a particular island. Since air travel between islands or to the mainland requires valid identification, immigrants without this documentation can experience additional vulnerability in Hawai‘i as their ability to leave a particular island community in search of work or better conditions is severely limited.

Additionally, the ethnic mix of immigrant workers in Hawai‘i was thought to be more diverse than most mainland communities. This diversity, combined with the fact many Hawaiian locals are descendants of immigrant workers, likely produced very different discourses on immigration than might be found on the mainland. Therefore, it may be that in states bordering Mexico, for example, local discourses related to immigration and human trafficking would look very different, perhaps focusing more intensely on ethnic stereotypes or differences.
Hawai’i has a large and financially influential agricultural industry and a prominent history related to using migrant labor in this industry no doubt shapes local understandings of the phenomenon of labor trafficking. This is reflected in some participant comments regarding their impressions that perhaps labor exploitation enjoys a certain degree of tolerance. These participants suggested that because past generations in many local communities were also subject to exploitation on Plantations, these communities may be less outraged by current exploitation. It is interesting to note that while Hawai’i also has a strong history of labor activism related to Plantation era exploitation (Salzman, 2012), no participant made mention of this history.

Hawai’i also has unique contexts that may have contributed to discourses around sex trafficking. Participants discussed the general strategy in which pimps are thought to attempt to control sex workers by isolating them. These participants explained the unique way this strategy plays out in Hawai’i, resulting in the movement of sex workers between Hawai’i and the mainland and between islands. Additionally, the large presence of military bases and tourists in the Islands results in discourses on paid sex that may not be present in other local communities.

Together these issues highlight the need to consider local context when attempting to understand how human trafficking is conceptualized. The presence or absence of certain features, such as a large agricultural industry or the visible presence of immigrant groups or prostitution, will likely shape both which discourse strands are prominent and the variation of discourses within those strands. These varying discourses, in turn, are likely to have important effects on the local implementation of human trafficking policy.
Limitations

Three different analyses were conducted for this study: CDA, phenomenological, and numerical context analysis. Each has related strengths and limitations. The limitations of these analyses will be discussed separately below in order to do justice to the different philosophical backgrounds that underlie each approach.

Critical Discourse Analysis. There are a number of limitations to this method that should be noted. As discussed in the Methods Section above, Critical Discourse Analysis does not claim objectivity. Rather, texts are seen as possessing an almost inexhaustible range of interpretations. The particular questions asked of a text and the interpretations made are inevitably shaped by the motivations of the analyst (Fairclough, 2003). In line with the critical realist position towards science described in relation to CDA above, this “subjectivity” does not necessarily negate the worth of the study. In fact, in this stance most, if not all knowledge, is at least partially subjective (Parker, 1992). In recognition of this subjectivity, I have made an effort to be transparent about my motivations and frame of reference with regards to this study (see Validity and Reliability Section). My goal was to analyze the texts critically with regards to their implications for social justice. Other researchers with different foci would surely find different results.

Additionally, because of the focus in this study on the texts produced by service providers, the findings have limited applicability to stakeholders in other areas. For example, a study with participants from criminal justice or law enforcement backgrounds would likely produce texts with a much different focus. These groups may have stressed perpetrators more than the current sample. Thus, the sparse reference to perpetrators found in this study may be partially the result of the sample of participants
chosen. Other stakeholders may even include alternative or additional discourse strands, such as a more prominent strand on legal discourses. Thus, the results of this study are limited to discussing implications related to advocate and helper discourses on human trafficking.

Finally, the geographical particularity of these findings must also be emphasized. As this study has emphasized a need for contextualization in regards to understanding trafficking discourses, the temporal and geographical context of the study must be acknowledged. These results reveal discourses at a particular time (2013) and in particular local settings (Hawaii, Oahu, and Maui). Discourses are constantly being reshaped. Indeed, that is the crux of intentions to pursue more just discourses. Thus, these findings have limited applicability to other times and places. However, the idea that certain discourse strands and knots combine to construct human trafficking is flexible enough to be of use in other contexts.

Additionally, the importance of contextualizing human trafficking (though perhaps without labeling it as such) has been stressed by academics from different fields ranging from Anthropology (Brennan, 2008) to Legal Studies (Chacon, 2006). Given its presence in national level academic discourse, it seems that a framework based on contextualization may be generalizable to other settings. What this study adds to that conception is an analysis of whether this framework is implied in advocate and helper discourses in Hawaii. Advocates and helpers in other locations may or may not use discourses that stress contextual factors, such as a continuum of abuses. Thus, while several of the concepts presented in this study may be useful in other locations, the particular discursive contexts of those locations should not be overlooked. Because of this, it is not my intention to generate highly generalizable conclusions. Where local
human trafficking policy is concerned, it is likely that local discourses (influenced, of course, by national discourses) shape implementation. Improving how trafficking-related issues are addressed, then, requires understanding the local “story” about human trafficking. This study has attempted to understand one part (advocates and helpers) of the story of human trafficking in Hawai‘i.

**Phenomenological.** The phenomenological study shares many of the limitations already described above related to subjectivity and generalizability. Because this study focused more on the explicit content provided by participants, the characteristics of those participants represent an important limitation. Rather than the CDA focus on discourses that at least partly transcend individual characteristics and exist in a larger social consciousness, the level analyzed by the phenomenological approach focuses on the *intentional* meaning of the participants and, therefore, is linked much more strongly to the individual producing that meaning.

One limitation of the present study related to participant characteristics was the difficulty of locating participants with extensive experience with human trafficking on the neighbor islands. This in itself was an important finding and suggests an unevenness of trafficking resources and expertise, which are much more highly concentrated on O‘ahu. In terms of the findings from the phenomenological analysis, which were focused on definitional issues and power interests related to human trafficking, having more “layperson” views, while important, likely limited the full range of discussion on these topics.

**Quantification of Content in Newspaper Articles.** The quantification of the certain terms and themes in local newspaper articles was the most straightforwardly “objective” analysis in this study. One limitation has to do with the lack of neighbor
island newspapers. Including neighbor island newspapers in this analysis would have generated more confidence that the nomination strategies and discursive events located in the O‘ahu based newspapers were also applicable on Maui and the Big Island. However, I had difficulty obtaining access to these newspapers online without paying a large subscription fee. Therefore, the findings of the newspaper analysis can only be considered provisionally applicable to neighbor islands.

Additionally, as the coding system was based largely on the presence or absence of labels and names of cases/laws, it can only provide a broad picture of trends. A thorough study of the discourses present in the articles is needed to fully understand how the media perpetuates or privileges certain discourses over others.

**Future Directions**

The process described under Research Question 2b suggests a map for conducting socially just research into the various phenomena that are related to human trafficking. For my future dissertation project I hope to use this map to further expand the conceptual clarity of research in this area. I am particularly interested in better understanding the contextual setting of labor trafficking in Hawai‘i. While forced labor cases in Hawai‘i have been the focus of intense media attention, the newspaper review conducted in this study seemed to show that this case-specific attention has not resulted in sustained coverage of labor trafficking as an issue. Additionally, anecdotal stories relayed by participants on Maui and the Big Island indicated that “bad labor practices” were fairly common on those islands, and several of these neighbor island participants expressed a desire to better address this issue in their communities.

To accomplish this goal, the follow-up project will focus on the larger population in which labor trafficked persons are situated: the local immigrant and
migrant labor population. This approach allows for an exploration of the range of abuses and exploitation that this population faces, effectively re-contextualizing the problem of labor trafficking. Research documenting the challenges this population faces in their attempts to find employment can highlight aspects of local labor practices that an investigation focusing solely on labor trafficking cannot. Understanding the range and nature of local labor practices with regards to immigrant workers can also underscore the systemic context experienced by these workers.

In order to understand this context, it will be important to include migrant worker voices in a way that has often been lacking in human trafficking research. Throughout the human trafficking literature few of the studies include the voices of the formerly trafficked persons they seek to speak for (Aron et al., 2006; Brennan, 2005; Coonan, 2004 are notable exceptions). Additionally, it could be argued that the preoccupation of social science researchers with assessing the needs of survivors means that their voices are included in research studies “solely to confirm their victimhood rather than to engage them as interlocutors” (Cheng, 2008). In order to avoid taking a stance that confirms the victimhood of the migrant worker population, the qualitative methods can be used to systematically explore the lived experience of this often overlooked population. Understanding this lived experience and including migrant worker input can contribute to a holistic, rather than one-dimensional, view of this group as intentional social actors. In this way, it can engage them as agents and can take seriously their goals, preferences, and purposeful strategies for finding and maintaining work in Hawai‘i.

Using the information gathered from this qualitative phase to quantify challenges and potential exploitation that migrant workers face in Hawai‘i, as well as
their strategies for overcoming these challenges, will result in “numbers” that are more meaningful and useful because they can be grounded in the expressed perspective of the migrants themselves. These results can then be used by advocates to create awareness about the extent of the problem and to justify the need for action to address these exploitative practices. This proposed study, in following the suggestions outlined above, could be a blueprint or model for those interested in creating awareness around other types of trafficking.

Conclusion

The results of this study make clear the fact that human trafficking is a complex group of phenomena influenced by several, often overlapping, systemic contexts and subject to multiple competing discourses. It is no wonder that conceptual clarity around operationalizing a single definition has remained elusive. In using critical discourse analysis to dissect participant discussions of human trafficking, this study has shown that rather than merely describing the phenomenon of human trafficking, participants actively engage in the discursive “work” of constructing it. They do this by selecting and privileging certain discourses over others according to their preferences, interests, and values. Additionally, this study has shown that beyond being shaped by individual preference, often discourses on human trafficking perpetuate dominant cultural or social views, such as certain understandings of what it means to be a child or of what it means migrate without proper documentation.

These observations indicate that there are many versions of a discourse on “human trafficking” from which advocates and researchers can and do choose. The question then becomes how does one choose? In critically examining both the idiosyncratic variability of these discourses and the dominant cultural narratives they
reinforce, this study has attempted to understand the social justice implications of the various discourses observed in the participant interviews. If texts, including speech and conversation, are cites of discursive struggle, then in understanding the various implications of this struggle, one can deliberately engage in perpetuating and privileging constructions which accomplish the “work” of discourse in a purposeful manor. In the case of this study, the intended goal was to suggest ways in which a discourse on human trafficking may better perpetuate the goals of social justice.

Together these findings suggest that focusing on transparency, contextualization, rights, and the inclusion of marginalized voices, would move human trafficking research, advocacy, and intervention towards a more conscious pursuit of social justice. In providing transparency around the conceptual framework used in these enterprises, by using, for example, discursive maps, competing definitions can be made intelligible within the range of other definitions. Determining a clear conceptual framework can also make apparent the contexts, systems, and “border fields” in which a particular trafficking phenomenon is located, thus allowing for an investigation along a continuum of abuses and a holistic picture of the problem.

Deliberately emphasizing the systemic contexts and continua of abuses in which human trafficking is situated discursively links the extreme abuses that “count” as human trafficking to the range of other “ordinary” abuses that are often overlooked. Additionally, it makes apparent how injustices related to these systemic contexts contribute to the problem of human trafficking and the power interests that may benefiting from these unjust systems. This opens up areas for intervention that go beyond prosecuting the few who get caught taking advantage of the system(s).
Finally, emphasizing a discourse on the rights of marginalized populations rather than a discourse on consent (or lack thereof) can move advocates away from overly simplistic constructions of women, children, and immigrants as passive victims. Focusing on rights rather than consent centers the discourse on the exploitation and implies that regardless of whether an individual consents to a situation, exploitation is a violation of their rights. In order to effectively re-center human trafficking discourse on rights in a socially just and culturally sensitive way, advocates and service providers need to move towards a collaborative relationship with these populations. With these points in mind, a path to pursuing discourses on human trafficking that include the core value of social justice can be constructed.
Appendix A: Sample Interview Questions

*Interview Questions*

1) In what area of human trafficking do you have experience?
   - Example) working with agricultural labor survivors

2) How long have you been involved with human trafficking issues?
   - Example probe: what kinds of work are you involved with related to trafficking?

3) What challenges do you face in your work?

4) In your experience, what has changed about how people address human trafficking issues since the time you began working in this area?

5) Has anything changed that makes your work easier/better? Harder/worse?
   - Example probe: How have recent state or federal policy changes impacted your work?

6) In your opinion, what is the best way to help those who have been trafficked in Hawai‘i?

7) In your opinion, what is the best way to prevent human trafficking in Hawai‘i?

8) What would you change, if anything, about anti-human trafficking efforts in Hawai‘i?

9) Is there any question about human trafficking or your work that I should have asked?
Appendix B: Consent Form

University of Hawai‘i at Manoa
Consent to Participate in Research Project:

EXPLORING HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN HAWAI‘I FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

I am conducting a project as part of my Masters’ thesis research requirements. The purpose of my particular project is to better understand how local service providers view efforts to prevent human trafficking and help survivors of trafficking. I am asking you to participate in this research project because you have experience working in the field of human trafficking and your opinions are very important to understanding human trafficking in Hawai‘i.

Activities and Time Commitment: If you participate in this project, I will meet with you for an interview at a location and time that is convenient for you. The interview will consist of 6-10 open-ended questions, and will take 45 minutes to an hour. Interview questions will include questions like, “In your experience, what has changed about how people address human trafficking issues since the time you began working in this area?” Only you and I will be present during the interview. I will audio-record the interview so that I can later transcribe the interview and analyze the responses.

Benefits and Risks: There will be no direct benefit to you for participating in this interview. I believe there is little risk to you in participating in this research project. If however, you become uncomfortable answering any of the interview questions or discussing topics with me during the interview, you can skip the question, take a break, stop the interview, or withdraw from the project altogether.

Privacy and Confidentiality: During this project, I will keep all data in a secure location. Only my University of Hawai‘i advisor, a student research assistant, and I will have access to the data. After I transcribe the interviews, I will erase/destroy the audio-recordings. When I type and report the results of my project, I will not use your name or any other personally identifying information.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may stop participating at any time without any penalty or loss.

If you have any questions about this research project, please call me at (267) 240-5829 or email me at kdg8@hawaii.edu. You can also e-mail my advisor, Dr. Charlene Baker at bakercha@hawaii.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this project, you can contact the University of Hawai‘i, Human Studies Program, by phone at (808) 956-5007 or by e-mail at uhirb@hawaii.edu.

Signature:

I have read and understand the information provided to me about participating in the research project, Exploring Human Trafficking from the Perspective of Local Service Providers.

My signature below indicates that I agree to participate in this research project.

Printed name: _____________________________________

Signature: _______________________________ Date: ____________

My signature below indicates my consent to be audio recorded.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: ____________
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