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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Human Trafficking is described as the modern form of slavery. It victimizes millions of people worldwide but is substantially hidden. Trafficking in persons (TIP) only recently has become the object of widespread public concern. Although there has been increased attention devoted to combatting trafficking and developing effective counter-trafficking in persons (C-TIP) measures, the covert nature of the problem has limited research and prevented rigorous assessments of the effectiveness of C-TIP programs.

To address the lack of systematic evidence, the Learning Division in USAID’s Center for Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG) collaborated with the DRG Human Rights Division and USAID/Guatemala on the development of a pilot C-TIP Knowledge, Awareness and Victim Identification Survey.

Guatemala was selected for the pilot survey because of the perceived severity of its trafficking problem and because of significant on-going efforts by the Government of Guatemala (GoG) and USAID/Guatemala to combat the problem.

Definitions and Measurement

Human trafficking discussions are plagued by definitional disputes. The Palermo Protocol, embraced by USAID and the U.S. Department of State, is the closest to an international standard and is used explicitly in this report.

Although this study seeks to understand the experience of human trafficking victims, identifying and interviewing individuals in various forms of slavery is not feasible for obvious reasons. Not only are trafficking victims unlikely to have the freedom to answer the door when an interviewer knocks, they also are unlikely to be allowed to answer sensitive questions even if they do answer the door. To compensate, the C-TIP Knowledge, Awareness and Survivor Identification Survey focuses on identifying trafficking survivors – individuals who have been victims of trafficking at some time in the past but are now free and able to report candidly on their experiences if they choose to do so.

To identify trafficking survivors, a series of overlapping methods are used. First, respondents are read a layperson’s version of the Palermo definition and asked to indicate, subjectively, whether they think that they were ever trafficked according to the definition. Second, because some individuals might not correctly interpret the definition or apply it appropriately to their own circumstances, respondents also were asked a series of questions about work experiences that might indicate, more objectively, whether they were coerced, deceived, entrapped or otherwise trafficked according to the Palermo definition. Third, the survey used List Experiments to allow individuals to indicate anonymously whether or not they were trafficked. Finally, respondents also were asked if they know any trafficking victims as a way of triangulating the level of trafficking in Guatemala from several perspectives.
The Sample Survey

The Guatemala C-TIP survey employs a multi-stage probability sample of 4996 respondents ages 15-45. The sampling frame consists of two parts, a national sample of 997 individuals and an oversample of 4234 individuals who were deemed by key informants to be at higher risk of being trafficked by virtue of their demographic characteristics and geographic locations. The sample was post-weighted based on sex, ethnicity, urban-rural residence and government district.1

Surveys were conducted in five languages, Spanish, K’iche, Mam, Kaqchikel, and Q’eqchi, collectively accounting for the primary language of 96 percent of respondents. The remaining interviews were conducted in the respondent’s second language, Spanish in all cases. Surveys averaged just over one hour in length and were conducted face-to-face in respondents’ homes. The first round of interviews was carried out in November 2013; the second began in December, 2013 and concluded in March, 2014.

Summary of Results

The several methods used to define survivors and to estimate the extent of human trafficking in Guatemala yield highly similar results. They indicate that:

- Approximately eight to ten percent of Guatemalans between the ages of 15 and 45 are human trafficking survivors in the sense that they either report having been trafficked at some time in their lives or they report work experiences suggesting that they have been trafficked.
- This means an average of about 19,000 Guatemalans are initially trafficked each year.
- The average trafficking survivor has spent almost 5 years in servitude.
- In combination, these observations mean that a total more than 90,000 Guatemalans between 15 and 45 are victims of trafficking in an average year.
- Levels of human trafficking have remained remarkably stable over the past twenty-five years; there is no evidence to suggest that trafficking levels have been reduced appreciably over the past ten years despite GoG, U.S. Department of State and USAID policies and programs.
- Labor trafficking is the most common form of trafficking accounting for more than 85 percent of survivors. Less than one percent of survivors say explicitly that they have been forced into prostitution, although 14 percent experienced “sexual exploitation,” a likely euphemism for prostitution in many cases.
- Trafficking survivors overall are slightly more likely to be men. They also are slightly more likely to be urban residents, both of which run counter to the prevailing narrative on which experts in Guatemala’s and USAID’s counter-trafficking communities base their counter-trafficking programming.
- Sex trafficking is predictably higher for women than men, but even among women, labor trafficking is three-times more common than sex-trafficking.

---

1 The nationwide sample of 997 individuals was poorly designed and/or administered by the contactor and survey sub-contractor, as a result of which the sample included 67 percent women compared to 51% women in Guatemalan census figures. Consequently, the post-weights for males in the national probability sample are rather larger than best practices would allow. The larger oversamples of at risk groups were not affected by this bias.
• Ladinos are more likely to be trafficking survivors than members of indigenous communities, a finding that also contradicts the standard narrative.
• Trafficking victims tend to reside in ‘bad neighborhoods’. They not only are relatively poor but are more likely to be recent victims of crime or violence. They also are more likely to have worked as children, know other trafficking victims, and perceive themselves to be victims of gender or ethnic discrimination.
• The strongest predictor of being victimized is working away from home – although the percentage reporting having worked away from home is lower than conventional wisdom holds.
• Victims typically are first trafficked as children or adolescents. The average age of initial victims, 16.5 years, is slightly younger for men than women.
• Contrary to conventional wisdom, sexual exploitation starts later in life than other forms of trafficking – at age 22 on average.
• Begging is the longest-lasting form of trafficking for individuals; the average victim is forced to beg for eight years. Sex trafficking has the shortest average duration at three years; labor victims toil an average of five years.
• Trafficking survivors primarily blame their families for involving them in trafficking. Friends and neighbors also are frequently blamed. Few survivors blame “bad actors” such as recruiters, employers, coyotes, gangs, the military or police.
• Contrary to key informant opinions, there is no evidence that trafficking in Guatemala is substantially linked to drugs or gangs. Victims are no more likely to be recruited either along drug trafficking routes or along the Mexican border. Survivors seldom mention drugs or gangs when asked to identify those responsible for exploitation.
• The majority of victims escape from servitude on their own; many fewer are rescued by families or released by their employers. Virtually none report being rescued by government authorities.
• About 5 percent of survivors report being trafficked a second time. Recidivism occurs mostly among labor trafficking victims and is negligible among sex trafficking victims.
• Most survivors receive little help from their families and less from their communities when they are free. Most report that the reaction of their communities is one of indifference rather than either sympathy or blame.
• Less than a quarter of survivors receive medical, legal, housing, psychological, or security assistance. Those few who do receive services are largely satisfied with the assistance they receive.

Regarding the broader public’s knowledge and awareness of human trafficking:

• Only 36% of citizens aged 15 to 45 have heard the term, ‘human trafficking’, and only six percent say they have heard of Article 202, the watershed anti-trafficking legislation enacted by Guatemala in 2009.
• Of those who have heard of trafficking only 19 percent (seven percent of the entire sample) can provide any sort of definition. Even then, most definitions are generic and identify non-specific social “bads” such as poor working conditions unconnected to coercion or deception.
• Knowledge and awareness of trafficking are significantly higher among urban residents and Ladinos. They are lower in rural and indigenous communities. Men are slightly more aware of trafficking than women.

• Values matter; knowledge and awareness are strongly related to “moral traditionalism” or the conservative belief that society would be better off upholding traditional values rather than surrendering to moral relativism.

• Contrary to the assumption underlying much USAID and GoG CTIP programming, knowledge and awareness of trafficking appear largely unrelated to the risk of being trafficked. Knowledge and awareness also do not discriminate significantly between trafficking survivors and those who have never been victimized.

• At the aggregate level, government Districts with higher levels of knowledge and awareness do not exhibit lower levels of trafficking. Nor is there evidence at either the individual or aggregate level to suggest that raising knowledge and awareness will reduce the incidence of trafficking.

• People perceive the risks of human trafficking to be very high on average. They correctly perceive the risks are greatest for younger people. The incorrectly perceive women to be at greater risk than men, and they mistakenly believe indigenous groups are more at risk than Ladinos. These (mis)perceptions are all consistent with the standard trafficking narrative communicated by GoG and USAID C-TIP experts.

• People want the government to do everything possible to combat human trafficking including requiring children to stay longer in school, providing greater public information about trafficking, creating greater economic opportunities for those at greatest risk, and enacting stronger C-TIP laws. Support also exists for prosecuting the clients of prostitutes, passing stronger drug laws and tightening border controls.

• Guatemalans overwhelmingly support increased government services for trafficking victims including medical and legal services, more shelters and more protection.

The research does NOT provide rigorous impact evaluations of specific C-TIP programs or policies. The results do, however, have a variety of policy implications.

• Human trafficking in Guatemala is an economic problem much more than it is a legal or educational problem. Trafficking is driven by impoverished families, who lack economic options, and who exploit family members as a necessary evil. Circumstantial evidence suggests that those who are exploited often acquiesce in their servitude more or less willingly in order to advance, however marginally, both their families’ and their own economic well-being.²

• Counter-trafficking policy in Guatemala is based largely on the misconception that trafficking is an organized criminal enterprise in which adolescent girls, unaware of the dangers of quitting school and leaving home, are abducted or seduced into sexual servitude. Sex trafficking of minors by criminal elements certainly exists in Guatemala and is horrific. It appears from the survey evidence, however, to be among the least common forms of trafficking.

² Importantly, the Palermo Protocol holds explicitly that consent of the victim is irrelevant as to whether a person has been trafficked.
• Families likely do not traffic family members out of greed or avarice and are unlikely, as a result, to be deterred by the threat of prosecution or imprisonment. Trafficking appears to be driven by economic desperation or necessity; it is a crime of necessity not choice.

• People are not trafficked because they lack knowledge about the risks. They know the risks but appear to accept them as preferable to the risk of doing nothing to enhance their families’ or their own economic well-being and survival.

• Strengthening laws and law enforcement capabilities is commendable and may have some marginal effects on trafficking. However, it is unlikely to have substantial effects. Gangs and other criminal elements appear to constitute no more than about 5% of the trafficking problem. Eliminating them entirely will hardly dent the trafficking problem, although it may eliminate the very worst aspects.

• Further efforts to raise awareness of the risks of trafficking may increase families’ guilt and anguish about their exploitation of their children, but is unlikely to produce widespread changes in behavior.

• Increasing services for the survivors of trafficking is commendable as well. The larger problem, however, is not the supply of services or their quality. The problem is identifying the vast majority of trafficking survivors, virtually none of whom have any post-trafficking contact with public officials or service providers, and enrolling them in the programs that already exist. The problem is one of ‘demand’ not ‘supply’.

• In the short term, the evidence suggests that an effective C-TIP strategy should focus on economic programs such as higher mandatory minimum wages for domestic workers and laborers; increased job training programs both in schools and for recent trafficking survivors; income assistance programs for the poorest families that would allow them to feed their families without exploiting their children; systematic outreach programs to identify recent survivors of labor as well as sex trafficking and enroll them in assistance programs.

• In the longer term, the most effective counter-trafficking programs will be those that undertake fundamental social, economic political reforms designed to reduce inequalities of power, wealth and opportunity.

• Current C-TIP programs are badly designed to address the symptoms of trafficking, and not at all directed toward addressing the root causes.
INTRODUCTION

Human trafficking is frequently described as the modern form of slavery. Trafficking is believed to be widespread and growing. Free The Slaves estimates that human trafficking flourishes in virtually every country in the world with as many as 21 to 36 million victims worldwide.³

The issue of human trafficking only recently has become the focus of concerted counter-trafficking activity. Since 2001, USAID has programmed an average of $16 million annually to combat both labor and sex trafficking in 68 countries and regional missions.

Because there is little systematic research to inform and guide C-TIP programming, existing programs have focused broadly on the ‘common sense-based’ “Four P’s” paradigm: 1. Prevention and awareness-raising activities, including interventions intended to address root causes; 2. Protection of survivors by providing direct services and increasing the capacity of first responders; 3. Prosecution of traffickers and the enactment of legislation criminalizing trafficking; and 4. Partnerships, both regional and between relevant government agencies, NGOs and corporations.⁴ Although the Four Ps provide the basis for U.S. government C-TIP policy and programming, their efficacy has yet to be rigorously tested.

Despite the severity of the problem, the covert nature of trafficking has limited rigorous and systematic research on the nature and extent of human trafficking, its underlying dynamics, and the effectiveness of counter-trafficking programs. Current victims of trafficking are largely hidden, fearful of retribution if they are exposed, and concerned about being stigmatized afterwards by family and friends (Tyl dum and Brunovskis, 2005; Tyl dum, 2010).

In response, most research on trafficking has involved in-depth interviews with small numbers of victims – typically young women rescued from prostitution and in the custody either of the police or of social service agencies.⁵ Although there is considerable value in this research, the limited number of cases and the purposeful way that victims are identified means that those who have been interviewed cannot be presumed to be representative of the much larger population of hidden victims. It also is hard to assess the reliability of the information generated since we cannot know how candidly victims answer sensitive questions when their identities and answers are known to researchers and often to the agencies in whose custody the victims are held.


⁵ Among the best of the qualitative work on trafficking is Shelley (2010), who also provides an excellent review of the mostly qualitative, literature. Langberg (2005) and Guinn (2008) provide summaries of mostly qualitative research on trafficking in Latin America. Entering “human trafficking” into an internet search engine will identify literally dozens of organizations and published works that subscribe in most respects to the standard trafficking narrative.
One consequence of the use of “convenience” samples is that they are driven by and tend to reinforce the conventional wisdom or stereotypes that trafficking victims are young girls ensnared and imprisoned by criminal elements and forced into sex work where they are locked up and have their documents confiscated. Researchers and counter-trafficking in persons (C-TIP) officials are quick to acknowledge that trafficking is multi-faceted; that it involves many different types of both labor and sex trafficking; that victims can be male or female, young or old; and that perpetrators range from gangs, to labor recruiters, to friends and even family. Despite such disclaimers, however, the standard narrative underlying and informing research and government programming on trafficking overwhelmingly focuses on adolescent girls captured and coerced into the sex trade by criminal organizations often engaged in drug trafficking (see, for example, the summaries in Langberg, 2005; Guinn, 2008; and Shelley, 2010)6

The inability to identify representative samples of victims means that existing estimates of the scope of human trafficking in most countries are little more than poorly educated guesses, as are assessments of the types of trafficking that are most prevalent. Even less is known about the victims themselves, who they are, how they became ensnared, what knowledge, attitudes, values and practices may have contributed to their plight, or the circumstances surrounding their rescue or escape.

In response to this situation, USAID and other federal agencies and foundations have begun supporting more systematic research on trafficking using survey research and impact evaluations among other methods to generate more systematic and reliable evidence.7 Rather than focusing on hard-to-identify victims, this research typically focuses on identifying large samples of human trafficking survivors, former victims who have escaped or been freed from servitude. As part of this research program, the Center for Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG) at USAID partnered with the USAID/Guatemala on the design and execution of a pilot, C-TIP knowledge, awareness and survivor Identification survey in Guatemala.

The Guatemala C-TIP survey had a three-fold purpose: first, to identify and interview a representative sample of trafficking survivors in Guatemala so as to better understand the dynamics of human trafficking; second, to assess the Guatemalan public’s knowledge and awareness of trafficking including the perceived risks of being victimized and the sources of assistance available to trafficking victims/survivors; and third, to develop a survey research instrument that can be used globally to assess the nature and severity of human trafficking in diverse contexts.

This report proceeds as follows: Part I provides some background to the study. It describes the context of trafficking in Guatemala as reported by the U.S. Department of State, and it reviews recent efforts by the Government of Guatemala and USAID to counter the trafficking problem. It proceeds to discuss

---

6 The standard narrative has been popularized and reinforced in fiction including in such blockbuster books and films as Stieg Larsson’s, The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo (2008) and especially the second volume in the trilogy, The Girl who Kicked the Hornet’s Nest (2009).

problems of defining and measuring human trafficking and explains the definition and measures of human trafficking used in this report. It also provides a brief overview of the survey project including a discussion of the sampling frame and methods.

Part II begins the data analysis. Having identified trafficking survivors, the data are used to explore survivors’ backgrounds, attitudes and beliefs and to examine the circumstances under which they were first trafficked and later became free.

Part III focuses on Guatemalans’ knowledge and awareness of human trafficking, which are low overall but vary significantly and in important ways across regions and population sub-groups.

Part IV steps back from the data and provides a broader perspective. It addresses the larger meanings of the survey results and the implications of the data for C-TIP policy and programs. Finally, because the survey is a pilot project intended in part to develop and test a survey tool adaptable to other human trafficking environments, Part IV also includes a short section addressing some of the lessons learned about conducting survey research on human trafficking.

I. BACKGROUND

A: The Context of Human Trafficking in Guatemala

Guatemala was selected for the pilot survey because of the perceived severity of its trafficking problem and because of significant on-going efforts by both the Government of Guatemala (GoG) and USAID/Guatemala to combat the problem.8 The U.S. Department of State’s, Trafficking in Person’s Report (June, 2016),9 identified Guatemala as suffering from all forms of human trafficking including both sex and labor trafficking of women, men and children. Guatemala is considered a source country for trafficking as well as a destination and transit country; it also suffers internal trafficking. The GoG is categorized as a Tier II country in the State Department report.10

8 The DRG Human Rights and Learning Divisions solicited interest from USAID missions to participate in the C-TIP survey. A dozen missions expressed interest. Guatemala was chosen based on a combination of factors including the nature of the trafficking issue in the country, the mission and government’s ongoing C-TIP activities, and the mission’s interest and ability to provide logistical assistance.

9 https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/258879.pdf

10 To paraphrase the report: Within Guatemala, women, girls and boys are thought to be widely trafficked for sex, exploited by their criminal elements, boyfriends, and others. Guatemalans are subject to labor trafficking as farm workers in the south, as factor workers in maquiladoras, in the mining areas of the north and northeast, as housekeepers in the homes of wealthy city residents, and as shoeshine boys, street vendors and beggars. Guatemala is a destination country for sex tourists from North America and Europe. It also is a destination for both sex and labor trafficking from other Central American countries and from South America. Finally, Guatemala is a transit country for trafficking moving across Guatemala from countries south of Guatemala for destinations in Mexico, the United States and Canada.
Although not yet fully compliant with Department of State C-TIP guidelines, the GoG, under the leadership of former Vice President Roxana Baldetti, enacted major new legislation to combat trafficking. USAID/Guatemala has invested substantially in assisting Guatemala’s efforts and otherwise working with NGOs supporting a broad range of C-TIP programming. The Government of Guatemala has taken significant steps to reduce human trafficking as well. Former Vice President Roxana Baldetti made human trafficking a signature issue, creating the Secretariat against Sexual Violence, Exploitation, and Trafficking in Persons (SVET) within her office to coordinate C-TIP activities nationwide. The government also enacted Article 202 of the Guatemalan Penal Code, which came into force in early 2009. The law prohibits the transport, transfer, retention, harboring, or reception of persons for the purposes of exploitation, including forced prostitution, sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, begging, slavery, illegal adoptions, or forced marriage.

In recent years the GoG has increased its funding for counter-trafficking activities, creating special police units and prosecutors devoted to C-TIP. They have increased funding for shelters and other forms of survivor assistance. The government also has expanded its efforts to raise public awareness of human trafficking. Still, various aspects of the GoG’s human trafficking record could be further improved. According to State Department statistics the number of persons arrested for trafficking in persons in Guatemala increased from 26 in 2008 to 39 in 2010 before declining to 32 in 2011. Trafficking convictions increased from 3 (out of 26 cases) in 2008 to 10 (out of 32) in 2011. The number of human trafficking victims detected and freed by the GoG has grown from 7 in 2008 to 56 in 2011. The gains are impressive, but the absolute numbers are still very small, especially given the extent of the human trafficking problem. Moreover, all but four of the trafficking cases pursued by the government have involved sex trafficking; only 2 were labor trafficking cases.

**B: Defining and Measuring Human Trafficking**

Defining human trafficking is a controversial undertaking. Discussions of human trafficking both in the research literature and in the policy domain are consumed by definitional debates. Do victims have to be physically enslaved and restrained by chains and locks or is psychological coercion sufficient? If psychological coercion is considered, how much coercion is sufficient to constitute trafficking under the law? Must victims be transported in the process of their enslavement? If so, how far? Can children be trafficked by their parents? If so, how can trafficking be distinguished from culturally permitted forms of child labor? Can a person be a victim if, at any point, she or he consents to the work? If so, what is ‘coercion to consent’ ratio is necessary for trafficking to be said to occur?

The Palermo Protocol\(^1\) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 2000 and ratified by more than 160 countries including the United States attempts to achieve an internationally agreed definition of human trafficking. According to the Protocol (p.2):

---

(a) Trafficking in persons shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.

(b) The consent of a victim of trafficking . . . shall be irrelevant where any of the means set forth [above] have been used;

(c) The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child [anyone under 18] for the purpose of exploitation shall be considered "trafficking in persons" even if this does not involve any of the means set forth [above] (emphasis added).

Even among those who embrace the Palermo definition, the identification of trafficking victims remains an interpretive exercise. The Palermo definition is sufficiently vague in various respects that C-TIP experts in the same agency disagree about what does and does not constitute trafficking. For example, the nature and extent of coercion required for trafficking is slippery and hard to apply to concrete situations. Experts agree that children abducted by a stranger and forced to work in the fields or a brothel are clearly trafficked; they differ however on whether children are victims when taken out of school (with or without their consent) and forced to work in the fields by their parents who ‘confiscate’ the children’s pay.

In Guatemala, the government incorporates the language of Palermo verbatim in their trafficking laws. In practice, however, judges and prosecutors sometimes interpret the law as requiring that a victim be recruited AND transported contrary to the explicit Palermo Protocol either/or formulation. Thus, an 18 year old woman who was taken from the countryside to Guatemala City by her boyfriend and pressured to work as a prostitute to support him would be defined as a trafficking victim. However, a woman living in Guatemala City who was pressured into prostitution in a neighborhood brothel by her boyfriend would not be a defined by the GoG as a human trafficking victim since she was not transported any significant distance. To complicate matters, a 17 year old girl would be a human trafficking victim in both of these circumstance since the prostitution of minors is considered sex trafficking according to Palermo regardless of the degree of coercion or extent of transportation.

As such cases illustrate, there is no single “objectively right” definition of trafficking to which everyone agrees and that can be applied cross-nationally. The best that can be done is to provide what scientists call operational or ostensive definitions which are consistent with Palermo and which consumers of this
report can clearly understand, even if they may not agree with all aspects of the definition and how it is interpreted.\textsuperscript{12}

This study begins by embracing the Palermo Protocol and proceeds along two tracks to operationally define human trafficking survivors (i.e. former victims) in practice.\textsuperscript{13} First, a layperson’s version of the Palermo Protocol definition is read to respondents early in the survey and, then, asked if asked if this has ever happened to them:

Trafficking ['\textit{trata}' in Spanish] is when someone is recruited, transported, or held through the threat or use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, or the abuse of power for the purposes of exploitation. Exploitation includes the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery. Trafficked individuals are treated as possessions and made to do work that they do not want to do through physical force or threats of force against the person or their family. Trafficked individuals are often told lies about the type of work they will do or the amount of money and benefits they will receive. Trafficking can happen at home, anywhere in Guatemala or in another country. With this definition in mind, do you think that that you have ever been a victim of \textit{trata} at any time in your own life?

In essence, individuals are asked to interpret the Palermo definition for themselves and apply it subjectively to their own experiences. This sort of self-identification is the same process used by criminologists to measure the incidence/experience of crime. Self-identification also is the usual method for measuring the incidence of bribe paying by individuals – although in these other cases, respondents

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{12} An operational definition identifies or defines a “thing” in terms of the processes used to establish or measure its presence and quantity. There can be many different operational definitions of the same entity. A thermometer uses inches of mercury in a tube as an operational definition of temperature. A pyrometer uses thermal radiation levels as operational measures of temperature. Similarly, gross domestic product (GDP) is an operational definition of national wealth; gross national product (GNP) is another. An ostensive definition is similar and identifies something by pointing to examples of it. We can define a horse by pointing to a Palomino, an Appaloosa, and a Clydesdale but not to a Zebra. Neither type produces an ‘objective’ definition. Indeed, they are used precisely when objective definitions are not possible. Instead they seek to create an inter-subjective definition – one that allows the research producer and consumer to share an understanding of what the researcher means by ‘temperature,’ or ‘horse,’ or ‘human trafficking’ even if they do not agree on their objective meaning. ‘Individual A’ thinks a Zebra is a horse; ‘Individual B’ does not, but at least ‘B’ understand that when ‘A’ says horse, s/he is including Zebras. For further discussion see, Sartori (1970) and Gould (1984).

\textsuperscript{13} Although this study seeks to understand the experience of human trafficking victims, identifying and interviewing individuals in various forms of slavery is not feasible for obvious reasons. Not only are current victims unlikely to have the freedom to answer the door when an interviewer knocks, they also are unlikely to be allowed to answer sensitive questions even if they do answer the door. Moreover, if a representative sample of current victims could somehow be identified, interviews would provide only a snapshot of current practices. They could not illuminate how practices might have changed over the past ten to twenty years. For these reason the C-TIP Knowledge, Awareness and Survivor Identification Survey seeks to identify trafficking survivors – individuals who have been victims of trafficking at some time in the past but are now free and able to report candidly on their experiences if they choose to do so.
\end{footnotesize}
are rarely given any definition to guide them as the meaning of, for example, robbery, burglary or bribery.

It is possible, of course, that some individuals who clearly were trafficked according to the Palermo Protocol definition may not perceive themselves as victims even after the definition is read or may be reluctant to admit they are victims. Therefore the survey also includes a battery of questions asking respondents about specific work-related experiences they may have had at any time in their current jobs or while working away from home over the past three years either in Guatemala or abroad including:  

- Whether they were able to freely leave their job if they wanted;
  - Whether they feared they might be physically harmed if they tried to leave
  - Whether they feared that family members would be harmed if they tried to leave
  - Whether they feared they would be turned over to immigration authorities if they tried to leave
  - Whether their employer had confiscated their passport or other essential documents
- Whether they had been prevented by their employer from contacting family or friends while away from home;
- Whether they had been forced to pay off a debt before they could leave the job
- Whether they had been locked up or physically restrained by their employer from leaving work;
- Whether they had frequently been hit or physically assaulted by their employer;
- Whether they had frequently been forced to perform illegal acts by their employer;
- Whether they had been frequently forced to touch people in ways they didn’t like;
- Whether they had been frequently forced by their employer to attend brothels.

Viewed in isolation some of these experiences might be categorized as something other than human trafficking depending on context and severity. Still all of these situations are exploitative and coercive and are consistent with the “plain meaning” of the Palermo definition. It is reasonable to debate whether it is better if the definition identifies a few a few people who were not really trafficked or excludes a few people who actually were trafficked. This report errs on the side of inclusion.  

As noted, victims may not want to self-identify as a human trafficking victim out of fear of that they will be ostracized by family and friends or rejected by spouses or potential spouses because of the stigma

---

14 The decision to focus on respondents’ current employment or recent employment away from home was motivated by a concern with the frailty of memory. In this regard, the decision is consistent with crime victimization studies that typically focus on crimes experienced in the past 12 to 24 months.

15 NORC (2016) replicated aspects of this report using a different operational definition that required that individuals report two or more of these work related experiences to be considered former trafficking victims. Their more conservative measurement reduced the total number of trafficking survivors identified in the data by a total of 12 survivors, a trivial number. Importantly, substituting NORC’s more conservative measure of trafficking does not alter in any appreciable way the statistical results or substantive conclusions contained in the current report.
attached to particular forms of human trafficking (e.g., sexual exploitation). To address this concern, the survey also included a series of list experiments (Blair and Imai, 2012; Glynn, 2013) designed to allow a respondent to answer sensitive questions with reasonable confidence that the enumerator would be unable to know the respondent’s answer. For example, one quarter of respondents in the survey, randomly selected, are given a list of three experiences of varying probabilities and asked, “How many of these are true for/have happened to you? Don’t tell me which ones just how many?” For example:
1. “Have you ever been asked by a friend or family member for money”
2. “Have you ever been unable to pay your bills?”
3. “Have you been asked for a bribe by a government official?”

The other half of respondents (randomly selected) are given the exact same three questions but with a fourth question randomly inserted. For example:
4a. “Have you ever been threatened by your employer if you quit your job?”
4b. “Have you ever been forced to work without pay?” or
4c. “Have you ever been forced to have sex as part of work?”

These respondents are then asked, “How many of these four have happened to you. Don’t tell me which ones just the number that you have experienced.”

The order that the experiences are presented to respondents is randomized so that the sensitive question does not always come first or last on the list. Since the respondents are randomly assigned to the four groups, the difference in the mean number of experiences reported by the two groups can be reasonably assumed to measure the percentage of people in the treatment (i.e. four experience group) who experienced trafficking. List experiments do not reveal which specific respondents were trafficked; this is intrinsic to their design in order to encourage candid answers. However, list experiments can provide an aggregate level estimate of the number of people in the sample who would admit to being trafficked if they were not stigmatized or otherwise intent on hiding the experience. At minimum the results of the aggregate list experiment results can be used to validate the two individual-level measures of trafficking in the survey.

As a further effort to validate estimates of the extent of trafficking, respondents also were asked whether they know anyone who had been a victim of trafficking. Such third-party reports of trafficking are likely to be highly unreliable, but are useful to see if the other estimates are broadly consistent with third party reports.

C: Finding Rare and Hidden Populations:

A final issue that must be confronted in studying trafficking survivors is their relative rarity. Even where human trafficking is severe, trafficking is believed to affect relatively small percentages of the population. The Free the Slaves estimate of 21 to 36 million victims worldwide is stunningly large (and

---

16 Even victims of labor trafficking can be stigmatized sexually since it is not unusual for people exploited for labor to be exploited sexually as well.
controversially so) but constitutes less than one-half of one percent of the world’s total population. The number of trafficking survivors is certainly higher than the number of current victims given that survivors cumulate over time. Still, even if a country had ten times the number of survivors as current victims, the percentage of survivors would be less than 5 percent, which would total only about 50 respondents in a national probability sample of 1000 respondents – too few for meaningful statistical analyses.

To address this problem, the Guatemala C-TIP survey employed a ‘brute force’ strategy using a much larger than normal sample size. Most nation-wide surveys conducted in Guatemala use samples of 1000 to 1500 respondents. The Guatemala C-TIP survey by contrast used a sample size of 5000. Additionally, the study oversampled areas of the country and demographic groups identified by local C-TIP experts to be most at risk of being trafficked.\(^{17}\) Specifically the study oversampled individuals between 15 and 45 years of age living in:

- Lower socio-economic status (SES) zones within Guatemala City;
- Lower SES areas (Urban and Rural) of the provinces of Huehuetenango, San Marcos, & Quetzaltenango;
- Agricultural areas along the southern coast of Guatemala (both Ladino and Indigenous Communities);
- Cobán town and surrounding rural areas;
- Males in the mining areas around Lake Izabal and Salamá.

The first 997 interviews were conducted in October and November 2013. The remaining 4000 interviews were conducted in December 2013 and in February and March 2014.\(^{18}\) The survey instruments used for both samples were identical.\(^{19}\) The two samples were merged, post-weighted by age, sex, urban-rural

\(^{17}\) The initial plan was to conduct the survey in stages, beginning with an initial nationwide, multi-stage probability sample of 1000 Guatemalans ages 14 to 65 to be used to ‘prime’ a follow-up adaptive sample of about 4000 individuals in areas identified in the first stage as having high concentrations of survivors. Unfortunately, the inability of the contractor to implement the adaptive sample forced the survey team to resort to conventional oversampling techniques.

\(^{18}\) The long delay between the start and finish of the field work is sub-optimal but was necessitated by difficulties that the contractor experienced with the software used on the tablets. The use of tablets was necessitated by the number of survey experiments included in the study along with the complicated skip patterns. Of course, the use of tablets in survey research is increasingly the industry standard since it facilitates more complex surveys and also reduces data entry errors, and reduces costs.

\(^{19}\) The DRG Center’s Learning Division developed the Guatemala Counter-Trafficking in Persons Knowledge, Awareness and Victim Identification Survey in collaboration with the DRG Human Rights Division. Social Impact partnered with the Learning Division to develop, pretest, and carry out the field work for the survey which was subcontracted to The National Economic Research Center (CIEN), a Guatemala based public policy and research firm. The survey was conducted in the respondent’s preferred language. The instrument was written initially in
residence and government Department to insure a nationally representative survey. In the process, we removed from the sample the small number or respondents who were 46 years of age or older.

As discussed later in the report, expert assessments of human trafficking in Guatemala were substantially incorrect. As a result, the oversampling strategy did not identify any more trafficking survivors than would have been identified if all 5000 interviews had been selected according to the same multi-stage probability sampling frame as the first 1000 cases. Still, the final combined sample of 4997 individuals, ages 15-45, includes 433 individuals who we have identified as likely human trafficking survivors, one of the largest, most representative samples of human trafficking victims ever surveyed. Appendix A provides additional details regarding the sampling frame.

PART II. HUMAN TRAFFICKING VICTIMS IN GUATEMALA

A. Estimating the incidence of Human Trafficking

Figure 1 reports the percentage of Guatemalans who self-identify as human trafficking survivors (i.e., former human trafficking victims). It also reports the percentage who can be identified as survivors based on their reported work experiences. A total of 369 individuals or 6.6 percent of respondents in the survey self-identify as trafficking survivors when shown a card with the simplified Palermo Protocol definition provided above. About one percent of respondents also were identified as trafficking survivors based on their affirmative responses to one of more questions regarding their work experiences such as whether they had been physically prevented from leaving a job or had regularly been locked up at night by their employer. Because the two groups overlap, a total of 7.2 percent of

---

20 Because the over samples did not include respondents over 45 years, older citizens could not be properly weighted in the combined sample without the use of very large weights which would have allowed a very few cases to have unwarranted effects of the national probability estimates. Moreover, respondents over 45 years in the initial wave report very few trafficking experiences – most twenty years or more previously which calls into question the accuracy of their memories.

21 The absolute number of self-identified victims in the survey is 433, but when weighted to account for the oversampling of certain areas of the country, this figure is reduced to 369 weighted individuals out of a weighted sample of 5000.

22 The small number of survivors identified by asking respondents about the work experiences is a consequence in part of our decision to ask only about current and recent work experiences in order to minimize the deleterious effects of faulty long term memories. This also explains the relatively small overlap between self-identified victims and victims identified by work experiences. The self-identification question asked respondents whether they have ever been victims of human trafficking. The work experience questions in contrast focus only on the current job or on a job away from home within the past three years. Only about one-third of Guatemalans in the survey (ages 15-45) report that they currently hold a full time job and only about 3.5% report having worked away from home.
the sample (or 411 weighted respondents) are identified as trafficking survivors by the combination of these methods.

Several caveats need to be registered about these numbers. First, although the percentage of survivors as defined in this way is about 7.2% of the population, the current number of trafficking victims in Guatemala is almost certainly lower since survivors include anyone who was previously trafficked at any point in his/her life and is now free and living in Guatemala. Clearly, not all of the survivors were trafficked at the same time. Still, it is important not to discount the number of active victims too much since the number of survivors is likely a minimum figure. Not only are a number of survivors unlikely to self-identify for the reasons discussed, but the number of reported survivors does not include anyone who is currently being trafficked in Guatemala. Nor does it include any survivors of trafficking in a foreign country who have not returned home to Guatemala for any reason. The estimate also does not include Guatemalan survivors who have since moved to another country or died. The 7.2 percent figure is a snapshot of survivors of trafficking who were living in Guatemala in the winter of 2014. The estimate is based on the best available data. It is better than previous estimates given the rigor of the sampling frame and data collection, but it is an estimate nonetheless.

![Figure 1: Self-Reported and Hidden Human Trafficking Survivors in Guatemala Ages 15-45](image)

---

during the past three years. Moreover, the largest percentage of those currently employed define themselves as “self-employed.” Twice as many respondents define their current “employment status” as housewives, students, or unemployed. Since they were not currently in the workforce, they were not asked the battery of questions about coercive work experiences. Had the survey asked more broadly about the respondents entire occupational history, we suspect the percentage who would have been identified as trafficking survivors based on their occupational experiences would have been much higher and overlapped more with the self-identification measure.
To test the robustness of these figures, Table 1 reports the results of a list experiment which provides alternative aggregate estimates of several different forms of trafficking in a context where respondents are assured that the survey enumerator does not know if they were admitting being a survivor or not. The table shows that individuals in the randomly selected control group report experiencing an average of 1.31 of the three baseline situations (having ever been asked by a friend of family member for money; having ever been unable to pay bills; and having ever been asked for a bribe by a government official). Those randomly selected into the first treatment group received the same three control questions plus a fourth item asking if they had ever been physically threatened if they tried to quit their job. The treatment group reported experiencing an average of 1.41 of the four situations. The difference in means between the control and treatment groups (1.411–1.310=.101) indicates that 10.1% of respondents in the treatment group confidentially report having been threatened by an employer at some point in their lives if they tried to quit their job.

| Table 1. List Experiment I: Estimates of the Mean Levels of Various Types of Human Trafficking |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Control: Baseline Three Items                  | Mean Items  1.31 | Number of cases 712 | Difference in Means NA |
| Baseline + Threatened if you quit job          | Mean Items  1.41 | Number of cases 642 | Difference in Means .101 |
| Baseline + Forced to work without pay          | Mean Items  1.34 | Number of cases 627 | Difference in Means .030 |
| Baseline + Forced to have sex as part of Work  | Mean Items  1.26 | Number of cases 639 | Difference in Means -.048 |
| * Statistically Significant p < .05           |                 |                  |                   |

Baseline Items:
1. “Have you ever been asked by a friend or family member for money””
2. “Have you ever been unable to pay your bills?”
3. “Have you ever been asked for a bribe by a government official?”

A second randomly selected treatment group was given the same three control questions plus the treatment, “were you ever forced by your employer to work without pay.” Three percent of respondents in the second treatment group indicate that they had been forced by their employer to work without pay at some time in life. Because the two treatment groups are independent sub-samples, there is no way of knowing how many of those who were forced to work without pay also were threatened if they quit their jobs or vice versa. This means that the number of Guatemalans who have been prevented from quitting their job or forced to work without pay lies somewhere between 10.1 and 13.1 percent.

Importantly, however, when a third randomly selected treatment group was asked the three common control questions plus a treatment question about “being forced to have sex as part of your job,” respondents in the treatment group report a smaller average number of experiences than the control group. This is an incongruous result and suggests either that something went wrong with the randomization of the response items or, more likely, that the addition of the sex trafficking question somehow caused a significant percentage of respondents not only to under-report whether they were forced to have sex but also to under-report one or more of the baseline items.
A comparison of the four treatment and control groups with respect to the percentage of respondents by age, sex, region, education and income (not shown) finds no significant differences in the demographics of the four groups, which assuages concerns about randomization. Moreover, the survey included a second list experiment using the same three trafficking items but three different baseline items, which provides us with the opportunity to assess the reliability of the results in Table 1. Respondents, again, were randomly assigned to four different treatment and control groups with the proviso that no respondent could be assigned to the same treatment item as in the first experiment.

The results in Table 2 are similar to those in Table 1. In the second experiment the percentage of respondents indicating they have been threatened if they quit work is still positive although it falls from 10 percent to 2.4 percent. The percentage saying they had been forced to work without pay increases slightly to 4.6 percent and the percentage saying they had experienced sex trafficking remains negative and almost identical to the percentage in the first experiment.

| Table 2. List Experiment II: Estimates of the Mean Levels of Various Types of Human Trafficking |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | Mean Items      | Number of cases | Difference in Means |
| Control: Baseline Three Items | 1.13            | 664             | NA              |
| Baseline + Threatened if you quit job | 1.15          | 603             | .024            |
| Baseline + Forced to work without pay | 1.18          | 604             | .046            |
| Baseline + Forced to have sex as part of Work | 1.08         | 705             | -.044           |

* Statistically Significant p < .05
Baseline Items:
1. Have you ever traveled outside of Guatemala?
2. Do you make more money than you need?
3. Have your ever ignored laws that you don’t like?

Clearly the inclusion of sex trafficking in the list experiment distorts in some way the responses. One possibility is that some respondents are so fearful that they will be perceived as sex workers that they intentionally under-report the total number of items that apply to them to minimize the chance that they might be labeled as such. There is no way to test this directly, but if this suggestion is correct, we would expect that women would be more sensitive to the question than men. In fact, when the results of the first list experiment are analyzed separately for men and women, the difference in means for men on the sex question in Table 1 is +3 percent while it is -11 percent for women. This is strong circumstantial evidence in support of the conjecture that women are intentionally underreporting their experiences so as not to risk being labeled as a victim of sex trafficking.

Although the list experiment results for sex trafficking appear unreliable, the results for labor trafficking fall broadly within the range of the estimates produced in Figure 1 based on self-identification and reported work experiences. Averaging the results of the two list experiments suggests that approximately 6 percent of respondents have been threatened by an employer if they try to quit and roughly 4 percent have been forced to work without pay. Again, we do not know which individuals these are. As a result we cannot say how many individuals, if any, were both threatened and not paid, nor can
we calculate the combined level of labor trafficking other than to say that it falls somewhere between about 6 percent and 10 percent which is highly consistent with the 7.2 percentage estimate produced by the individual level data.

In addition to asking respondents if they personally have been trafficked, the survey also asked whether they “know anyone who has been trafficked.” Fifteen percent say they do which is over twice the 7.2 percent who self-identify as survivors. Since third-party reports are not as reliable as first-person recall, the survey probed positive responses by asking if the ‘known victim’ lived in the respondent’s community, or was a close friend or family member. The assumption is that third party reports will be more reliable if victims live in the same community or are especially close to the respondent. As shown in Figure 2, only 44 percent of known victims live in the respondent’s community and only 57 percent are family or friends.

Discounting third party reports of trafficking by focusing only on those who are family, friends or neighbors, we estimate human trafficking to be between 8.4 and 8.6 (15 X 0.57) percent (see Figure 3). This is lower than the 10.1 percent maximum estimate generated by combining the list experiments’ estimates of the two forms of labor trafficking, but it is slightly higher than the 7.2 percent estimate generated by combining self-identified survivors and those identified from recent work histories.

Although all of these estimates have limitations, those limitations differ from one estimate to another. In this sense the different estimates compliment and reinforce one another. In combination, they place the number of trafficking survivors in Guatemala at between 6 and 10 percent of the population with an
average of approximately 8 percent. Based on this evidence, it appears that that self-identification and labor histories slightly underestimate the number of trafficking survivors. Just as clearly, however, the extent of the under-estimate is small -- in the range of one or two percentage points. The consistency in the estimates across the different methods increases confidence in their validity.

**Figure 3: Validating the Survey Estimates of Trafficking Victims**

![Bar chart showing estimated percentages of trafficking victims from different methods]

B. The Scope of Human Trafficking in Guatemala

Accepting the triangulated estimate that approximately eight percent of Guatemalans between the ages of 15 and 45 have been trafficked at some time in their lives, it is an easy task to make some very general estimates of the scope of the trafficking in Guatemala both today and over time. For example, extrapolating from the survey sample to the population of Guatemala as a whole, the eight percent estimate means than more than a half million Guatemalans between the ages of 15 and 45 are human trafficking survivors.23

We cannot go back in time and measure victimization levels on a yearly basis. We did, however, ask the trafficking survivors in our survey their ages at the time they were trafficked. Since we also know the current age of survivors it is a simple task to calculate the year in which they were first trafficked.24

---

23 The is calculated simply by multiplying 8% times the total number of Guatemalans in 2014 who were between the ages of 15 and 45 years old.

24 Several assumptions underlie these calculations. First they assume that older and younger respondents recall the year in which they were first trafficked with equal clarity. They also assume that younger respondents are as
Figure 4 uses these reconstructed data to trace the percentage of survivors who were first trafficked each year since the early 1980s. The long time frame and relatively small number of survivors makes the yearly data (solid blue line) very noisy, so we smoothed the data by calculating a three-year moving average (dashed red line). Although there is considerable year-to-year fluctuation in the data, the overall pattern is remarkably flat over time. There is no evidence of a significant upward or downward trend in trafficking since 1980; an average of 2.9 percent of survivors (or about 0.02 percent of the population 15-45 years of age) report first being trafficked each year. Still, there are some clear spikes in the data, the most notable of which occurs around 2004 when the percentage of new victims jumps to almost 14 percent -- or more than four standard deviations above the mean. Smaller spikes are observed in the early 1980s and again in the early 1990s. These spikes do not line up with particular events and require further investigation which is beyond the scope of the current study.

Based on these data, it is relatively easy to calculate that an average of about 19,000 Guatemalans initially are trafficked each year (based on current population estimates). Given that trafficking willingness as older respondents to admit being trafficked, which for younger respondents is a more recent and possibly more sensitive topic. Still human trafficking is a horrendous experience that few people are likely to forget. Even if older respondents get the precise year wrong by a year or two, this will be captured and corrected by applying a three-year moving average to the data. Moreover, the sensitivity of more recent and better-remembered events is offset by the lesser sensitivity of older and somewhat more easily forgotten events. So the characteristic biases of younger and older respondents should at least partially cancel out.

This is calculated as the number of survivors initially trafficked in any year divided by the total number of survivors in the data.
survivors report being victims for an average of 4.8 years, this means that an average of more than 90,000 Guatemalans between the ages of 15 and 45 suffer as trafficking victims in a typical year.

As interesting as what the data show is what they do not. Human trafficking does not appear to have been any higher during the Guatemala civil war (1969-1996) than at present – at least among those who survived the war.\textsuperscript{26} Nor has the level of trafficking declined appreciably since the U.S. Department of State started monitoring counter-trafficking efforts in Guatemala in 2001. There also is no evidence yet of a decline in the incidence of trafficking following the implementation of Article 202 by the GoG in 2009. Nor is there any evidence that the U.S. State Department and USAID C-TIP programming in Guatemala has reduced the incidence of human trafficking. This does not mean that counter-trafficking efforts are not working, just that their effects, if any, are too small at this point to be registered by these rather crude trafficking estimates.

\textbf{C. Child Labor}

Child labor poses something of a gray area for human trafficking definitions. Children sold into slavery by their parents are clearly the victims of human trafficking; those forced, under penalty even of corporal punishment, to clean their room, do the dishes, or carry out the trash are clearly not the victims of trafficking. What is not clear is where to draw the line between the two. For example, are children victims of human trafficking if they are taken out of school and forced to work in the fields with their parents who confiscate their children’s pay? Even C-TIP specialists do not agree on where to draw the line.

To assess the nature and extent of child labor in Guatemala, we asked respondents to “think back on your life” and tell us the age at which “you began working for the first time, whether or not for pay, beyond doing basic chores within your own household.” More than 60 percent of men and almost 45 percent of women said that they began working before the age of 18. Of those who worked as children, the average age at which they began working was 12. This was the same for both men and women. A few individuals said they started working as early as age 4 and ten percent said they began earlier than age 10.

When asked what type of work they performed as children, the largest percentage said they did farm work (including 56 percent of men and 35 percent of women). Women were more likely to work outside the home doing housework or caring for children (Figure 5). Significant percentages of both women and men reported that their work involved carrying heavy loads, while smaller percentages made gravel or fireworks, shined shoes, begged or sold sundries on the street.

The incidence of child labor appears on the surface to have declined in recent years. When respondents are asked about their own children fewer than 10% said that their children worked outside the home before the age of 18. In fact, 70% of respondents said that children \textit{should not} work.

\footnote{26 Again, it must be noted that the C-TIP survey does not account for child soldiers.}
Parents’ reports of contemporary child labor are not entirely credible, however. When current minors are asked whether they work, 30 percent of 15 year olds say that they do along with 37 percent of 16 year olds and 56% of 17 year olds. When asked how old they were when they first went to work, the
average age reported by current minors is 13 years old, only about one year older than the average reported by older generations.

Finally, we asked those whose children currently work what type of jobs they held. The responses in Figure 6 show that the types of work of children today are very similar to the patterns characteristic of previous generations. There is a slightly higher emphasis on farm work today and virtually no one admits that their children beg, shine shoes or sell sundries, despite clear evidence to the contrary on every street corner in Guatemala City.

Because of the difficulty of determining who among the children who worked were trafficking victims, our calculation of human trafficking survivors ignores child labor unless those individuals self-reported themselves as victims. If they said they worked in the fields at 8 or shined shoes at 6 but did not self-identify as a trafficking survivor, we have not recorded them as survivors or victims. This almost certainly underestimates the number of human trafficking survivors, which makes the 8-10 percent figure quite conservative.

D. Profiles of Trafficking Survivors

Before constructing the trafficking survey instrument, members of the DRG Learning and Human rights Divisions conducted a scoping trip to Guatemala where interviews were conducted with more than forty key informants including representatives of USAID/Guatemala, the U.S. Embassy, the Government of Guatemala, the U.S. Military, various C-TIP, labor, and child welfare NGOs among others. The purpose of the trip was to understand the nature of the trafficking problem in Guatemala as viewed by local experts. There were certainly differences of opinion expressed by local experts regarding the details of the trafficking problem, but there was remarkable consensus that trafficking in Guatemala affected women more than men, was more prevalent in rural areas and in lower SES areas of Guatemala City, was more common in the indigenous communities, and was most prevalent along the Mexican border, in southern, coastal agricultural areas, along drug smuggling routes and in the poorest sections of Guatemala City. They also agreed that sex trafficking received more attention than labor trafficking from the government, the media and the public. They disagreed, however, on whether this was because sex trafficking was more prevalent than labor trafficking or whether sex trafficking was simply more newsworthy. The most common trafficking narrative cited by the elites who were interviewed, was that of adolescent girls who were coerced, sold or seduced into prostitution by criminal elements or unscrupulous boyfriends.

Figure 7 provides some basic demographic data on trafficking survivors in the survey and calls into question many aspects of the conventional wisdom about human trafficking in Guatemala. To begin, Guatemalan men are slightly more likely to be survivors of trafficking than women. The difference is small (7.7 percent of men report having been trafficked compared to 6.8 percent of women), but contrary to the standard narrative about trafficking. Urban residents also are more susceptible to trafficking than rural residents, and there are higher percentages of survivors among Ladinos than among the K’iche or other indigenous communities. Survivors also are more numerous among middle-
aged Guatemalans, although this is to be expected since what is reflected in Figure 7 is the current age of survivors and not the age at which they were first trafficked; the longer one lives the greater the likelihood of being trafficked at some time in life.
Figure 8 adds to this portrait and confirms that survivors are disproportionately poor and poorly educated, although there is a hard-to-explain spike in the number of survivors among upper middle-income respondents. Survivors also are more likely to be in common law marriages and less likely to be single, which is probably another manifestation of education and income.

Figure 9 goes beyond demographics and considers the nature of the environments in which trafficking survivors’ live. It demonstrates that victims live disproportionately in troubled households and ‘bad neighborhoods.’ Their lives were difficult even before they became trafficking victims, and they have continued to suffer relatively more than other Guatemalans even after escaping servitude. Survivors are much more likely than other citizens to have been victims of crime and to have been physically assaulted in the past year (mostly by family members according to data not shown). They are much more likely than those who have not been trafficked to think of themselves as victims of gender or ethnic-based discrimination. Survivors predictably are more likely to have worked away from home, either elsewhere in Guatemala or abroad, at some point in their lives. They also were more likely to have worked as children. Trafficking victims are more likely to know other trafficking victims. In brief, trafficking survivors live in a world of poverty, crime and violence. It is no wonder that they also report significantly lower life satisfaction than other Guatemalans.

![Figure 9: Trafficking Survivors Experiences of Victimization, Discrimination and Life Satisfaction.](image)

Consistent with the expectations of key informants, trafficking survivors are concentrated in low SES areas of Guatemala City. However, the map in Figure 10 contradicts expert opinions regarding trafficking
hotspots in other respects. Rather than being concentrated along the Mexican border or in southern agricultural areas, survivors live disproportionately in Chiquimula, Sacatepéquez, Suchitepéquez, and Petén. Indeed, survivors are least prevalent along the Mexican border. Trafficking in the rural areas of the Department of Guatemala is very low. So, despite the high concentration in Guatemala City, the overall concentration of survivors in the Department of Guatemala is about average.

Figure 10: Locations of Human Trafficking Survivors in Guatemala, 2014

A more nuanced portrait of Trafficking victims in Guatemala emerges from Figure 11 which summarizes a Multivariate Logit analysis of the relative contributions to trafficking of the several demographic variables previously examined plus a number of other measures of individual attitudes and beliefs believed to be associated with trafficking victimization. To reduce clutter, the figure reports only statistically significant predictors of trafficking. The results highlight the importance of working away...
from home either in another country or elsewhere in Guatemala). Someone who has worked away from home is more than 20 times more likely to be trafficked than someone who has not.²⁷

Working away from home in Guatemala is quite rare; only 3.5% of respondents in the survey say that they have worked away from their home in the past three years, whether elsewhere in Guatemala or abroad. Those few who do work away from home, however, are at considerable risk of being trafficked.

![Figure 11: Predictors of Human Trafficking Victims/Survivors](image)

Victims of crime and physical assault are the next most likely to be trafficking victims. Crime victims are almost 8 times more likely to be trafficked than those who are not; hitting victims are four times more likely to have been trafficked. These factors are additive so that a person who has been a crime victim and a hitting victim is 12 times more likely than non-victims to be trafficked.

Importantly, we do not know whether trafficking survivors were victimized in these ways before or after being trafficked, but the association points to a pattern of multiple victimizations. People at high risk of being victims of one social ill are at high risk of being victimized by other social ills as well. This is also evidence of bad neighborhoods. Victimization is community based. Poverty, illiteracy, prostitution and drugs are not distributed evenly across society but are concentrated in bad neighborhoods exposing the

²⁷ Coefficients in the table are Log Odds Ratios and represent the odds that a person will be trafficked if they possess a particular characteristic as compared to the odds of a person being trafficked if they do not possess that characteristic. A coefficient of 1.0 means that the odds are the same in both case; in other words the variable has no effect on the likelihood of being trafficked. Coefficients greater than 1.0 mean that the variable increases the risk of trafficking. Coefficients below 1.0 mean that the variable reduces the odds of being trafficked.
people who happen to be born and grow up in those neighborhoods to high risks of victimization in multiple ways.  

Rural residence, childhood labor, and age are weaker though still significant predictors of trafficking victimization. With regard to age, the coefficient indicates that the odds of being trafficked increase by .03 percentage points with each passing year. Although the increase is small from year to year the odds are cumulative and are much bigger over a decade or two.

The importance of rural residence is interesting in light of the bi-variate relationship previously reported in Figure 7 that urban residents are more likely to be trafficked. The fact that this relationship is reversed in the multivariate model is a reflection of the fact that urban neighborhoods are much more dangerous on average. Controlling for dangerous (urban) neighborhoods makes rural areas look worse as compared to less dangerous urban areas. It is the danger of the neighborhood more than their size, affluence or density that is the driver of human trafficking.

Education and positive feelings of personal control are negatively related to trafficking net of other influences. Every one-point increase on the five-point education scale reduces the probability of being trafficked by .63 percentage points. Those who feel more in control of their lives are less likely to be trafficked by .71 percentage points for each unit increase on the four point scale. Expressed more simply, better educated individuals and those who feel more in control of their lives possess more of the knowledge and more of the self-confidence needed to avoid many of the situations where victimization is most likely to occur. Finally, older citizens are more likely to have been trafficked, although as noted previously this may simply be a function of the amount of time they have been exposed to the risks of being trafficked and not that trafficking affects older people more than the young.

None of the remaining variables included in the multivariate analysis are statistically significant in spite of the fact that a number of them – including sex, income and ethnicity – are related to victimization levels in the bi-variate analyses. This is not to suggest the earlier analyses are wrong. Instead, it suggests that the effects of sex, income and ethnicity operate through other variables in the model. For example, men are much more likely to have worked away from home than women. Higher income individuals are better educated and are much less likely to live in bad neighborhoods where victimization is most prevalent. Ethnicity and religion also are linked to education and quality of neighborhood in ways which make these factors appear less important. The conclusion to be drawn is not that ethnicity and religion are unimportant but rather that their relationships to trafficking are function of factors such as education and residence which, if changed, would likely make ethnicity and religion much less relevant.

---


29 Another possibility, of course, is that the experience of being trafficked significantly reduces victims’ sense of self-control. Establishing direction of causality in surveys is difficult. In all likelihood the influence runs both ways, but testing this likelihood is beyond the scope of this report.
E. The Dynamics of Trafficking

Individuals who self-identified as trafficking survivors or who were identified by their work histories were asked a series of questions about their experiences as victims beginning with a question about the type of trafficking they experienced. Figure 12 summarizes the responses and clearly demonstrates the preponderance of labor trafficking in Guatemala. More than 90 percent of male and 80 percent of female trafficking survivors identified themselves as victims of labor trafficking.

In contrast, only 1 percent of women and only a single male said they had been forced into prostitution, although 29 percent of women and .4 percent of men report being victims of sexual exploitation – a phrase that may be a euphemism for prostitution in some cases. About seven percent of survivors including 11 percent of women describe their experience as slavery – which also could be a less threatening way for women to describe sex work. Interestingly men report being victims of forced marriage slightly more than women – although the numbers are small overall and the gender difference is negligible. Very small numbers mention forced begging or irregular adoptions which may reflect the effects of limited childhood memories.  

Figure 13 disaggregates the type of trafficking experienced by the different ethnic groups. Labor trafficking is the most prevalent type in all of the ethnic communities although it is significantly smaller

---

30 Forced marriage and illegal adoptions were not included in the definition of trafficking given to respondents, but the survey allowed respondents to choose these options to describe their victimization if they wanted.
in the K’iche community than the others. Similarly sexual exploitation is almost twice as high in the Ladino community as among the K’iche and it is lower still among other ethnic groups. Members of the K’iche community report much higher levels of slavery than the others, and forced marriage is concentrated almost completely in ethnic communities other than the Ladino and K’iche.

**Figure 13: Type of Human Trafficking Reported Disaggregated by Ethnic Communities**

**Figure 14: Age That Survivors Were First Trafficked**
Trafficking survivors also were asked how old they were when they were first trafficked. As reported in Figure 14, about a quarter of respondents report being trafficked before the age of twelve. Slightly more men were trafficked as children than women. Women are most likely to be trafficked as adolescents. The incidence of first trafficking declines after adolescence – somewhat faster for men than for women.

Figure 15 explores the age of first victimization somewhat further. It shows that there is no significant difference in the average age of victimization for men and women. The average age of first victimization is about 17 years for both. There also is little difference between urban and rural residents in terms of first victimization. Ladinos are slightly more likely to be trafficked but slightly older when this first happens to them. Members of the K’iche community are slightly less likely than Ladinos to be trafficked, but they are much younger on average when they are first victimized.

Regarding the different types of trafficking, forced begging predictably begins earliest -- at about ten years of age. Sexual exploitation begins the latest – at an average age of 22. Of course these averages disguise considerable variation. Still the conventional portrait of trafficking victims as adolescent girls forced into prostitution is very far from the norm. To be sure a small percentage of victims fit the stereotype and deserve all of the attention they receive. In sheer numbers of victims, however, adult women are more likely to be sex trafficking victims, although even among older women labor trafficking predominates. Adolescent women are much more likely to be victims of labor trafficking, and men, both adolescent and adult, are the most likely of all to be victims of labor trafficking. Trafficking victims have many faces, the most common of which belongs to a 17 year old male forced to work in the fields, in a maquiladora, or in a mine.
Once they are trafficked, victims are held in servitude for an average of five years (Figure 16). The duration of trafficking is the same for men and women and also for urban and rural residents. Children are forced to beg for somewhat longer, and those sexually exploited are trafficked for a somewhat shorter time on average. None of these differences, however, are large.

Figure 17 charts the average beginning and end of servitude for different sub-groups and sub-types. It also shows the average age for each group and type and highlights differences between the Ladino and K’iche communities. It highlights the late, short but intense nature of sexual exploitation which is suffered preponderantly by Ladino women. Also noteworthy is the very young age at which the K’iche are trafficked. This is all the more remarkable given that the K’iche are the group with the lowest incidence of forced begging (recall Table 13). The K’iche experience of trafficking also ends quite early, typically before the age of 15.

A closer look at the K’iche experience in Figure 18 shows that virtually all trafficking of K’iche men is labor trafficking. Given the typical age (10-15) at which K’iche are trafficked this means that they are likely being forced into the fields to work with their parents or they are working at home making gravel or engaged in other menial labor. K’iche women, in contrast overwhelming report being slaves. We suspect, based on on key informant interviews (but do not have survey data to prove) that slavery in this context means that they have been sent by their parents to the city to work as housekeepers for wealthy families where many are badly treated.
Since trafficking ends for most K’iche by the age of 15, the assumption is that trafficking ends because the men leave home and the girls run away from the families that enslaved them. This interpretation, however, is based on qualitative and circumstancial rather than direct evidence.

**Figure 17: The Human Trafficking Experience by Sub-Group and Sub-Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Age Trafficking Starts</th>
<th>Age Trafficking Stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladino</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’iche</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indigenous</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Labor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Begging</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18: Forms of Human Trafficking Within the K’iche Community Disaggregated by Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The conventional wisdom in Guatemala is that boyfriends are heavily implicated in sex trafficking while gangs, coyotes, and recruiters are widely believed to be complicit in all forms of trafficking. Fathers and other family members also feature prominently in the stories that Guatemalan experts tell about trafficking. To test these accounts, trafficking survivors were asked specifically who was most responsible for their being trafficked. Their replies, summarized in Figure 19, support some aspects of elite opinion but undermine others.

Figure 19: Who is Blamed by Trafficking Survivors? (Multiple Answers Permitted)

Overall, the data make clear that human trafficking begins at home; 12 percent of survivors blame one or both of their parents for their victimization. Another 13 percent blame other family members, and several blamed stepfathers and former spouses. Friends and neighbors are blamed by about 10 percent of trafficking survivors. When added together approximately one-third of survivors blame family and friends for their victimization.

Seven percent of survivors blame themselves for being trafficked, and 13 percent are unable to identify the person or persons who were responsible. Surprisingly employers are rarely blamed by survivors despite the prevalence of labor trafficking. Recruiters are blamed somewhat more frequently (4%) but less than conventional wisdom assumes. What is most contrary to elite opinion is the minimal blame for trafficking attributed to boyfriends (and girlfriends) and the even smaller blame given to coyotes, the police and military or gangs.
The prevalence of family members as perpetrators of trafficking highlights one of the prime obstacles to combating the problem. Guatemalans love their families and want the best for them. Although there may be a rogue father or husband who trafficks a family member out of greed, the extent of trafficking in Guatemala and the major role played by families in the process speaks to the widespread poverty in the country and the economic desperation so many families face. Guatemalans traffick family members because they perceive it as the only option for survival. Parents send a daughter to the city to be enslaved as a housekeeper because they hope it will provide her with food and shelter that they cannot provide and perhaps even an education. They also likely calculate that having one fewer family member at home will allow them to feed the remaining brothers and sisters a tiny bit better. Human trafficking for most families is an act of desperation. It is not one of choice.

This is not to say that bad actors do not exploit trafficking for corrupt purposes. Figure 20 explores this further by disaggregating who is blamed for trafficking by sex, ethnicity and type of trafficking. Predictably, women report their family as being complicit in their trafficking more than twice as often as men. Men on the other hand are almost three times more likely than women to implicate ‘bad actors’ including recruiters, coyotes and gangs. This is consistent with the previous observation that men are much more likely to leave home for work. More generally, men are more reluctant to blame on any one they know and are more likely to blame ‘unknown others.’ Although women who are trafficked blame boyfriends only in 7 percent of cases, boyfriends are blamed somewhat more frequently for sexual exploitation and slavery.

![Figure 20: Whose to Blame for Trafficking Disaggregated by Sex, Ethnicity and Type of Trafficking](image-url)
The K’iche are less likely than other ethnic groups to blame family members despite – or perhaps because -- the average age at which they are first trafficked is ten. Indeed, they are much less likely than other groups to blame anyone for begin trafficked. The do, however, place relatively more blame on boyfriends, which again is incongruous given the young age at which they are trafficked. Ladinos are somewhat more likely to blame friends and neighbors and bad actors although the differences in these regards are small.

There are considerable differences in who is blamed for different types of trafficking, which helps to explain some of the errors in conventional wisdom. For example, boyfriends little if any role in labor trafficking -- which accounts for more than 80 percent of all trafficking in Guatemala, although they do play somewhat larger roles in sexual exploitation, slavery and forced marriage. However, because relatively less frequent, sexually oriented, forms of trafficking garner much more attention from the government, the media, NGOs, and donor agencies (including USAID), the role of boyfriends appears outsized in trafficking narratives. Even so, the role of boyfriends is small even in sex trafficking. Family is complicit in more than 90% of sex trafficking cases and more than 80 percent of forced marriages. Bad actors exist, of course, and their activities are heinous, but their overall roles in trafficking appear minor. Trafficking in Guatemala is overwhelmingly a family enterprise born of economic desperation and only minimally an enterprise of organized crime.

F. The Ending and Aftermath of Trafficking

When those identified as survivors were asked how their their trafficking ended, most (54%) said that they took matters into their own hands and escaped (Figure 21). Smaller but significant numbers grew too old for the work, were rescued by family or friends, or were released by their employer, presumably because they were no longer worth their upkeep. Almost no one reports being rescued by authorities.
Figure 22 explores this further, disaggregating the ways that trafficking ended by sex, ethnicity and the age of the victim when first trafficked. As might be expected, those who were older when first trafficked were more likely to escape on their own. Among those trafficked as children, less than a quarter managed to escape. Among adults older than 25, more than 80% escaped by themselves.

Women are more likely to escape than men who, conversely, were somewhat more likely to be released voluntarily by their employers. Women and children were the most likely to be rescued by family and friends. Not much can be said about trafficking rescues by the authorities since there are so few of them. The few who were rescued, however, were all adults.

Interestingly children trafficked under the age of 12 are most likely to say they grew too old to be trafficked. One possibility is that children become less sympathetic as beggars as they grow older and are released by the traffickers when they do. The problem, however, is that Table 23 shows that those trafficked as beggars do not list growing too old as the reason their begging ended. Growing too old is associated almost exclusively with labor trafficking. It is possible that growing too old for children means that they grow to old to make fireworks or break gravel or simply that they grow old enough to move onto other more profitable forms of labor.

Figure 22: How Different Types of Trafficking Ended

Figure 23 also shows that victims of sexual exploitation are more likely to escape than other trafficking victims. Victims of forced begging, who overwhelming are children, never escape. Trafficking ends for
them either when they are released by their captors or rescued by their parents. Among the few victims rescued by the authorities, most describe themselves as slaves.

The end of trafficking, unfortunately, does not end the risk for survivors. Horrible though it is, a return to trafficking may be the only way that trafficking survivors can find to survive. Some victims may even develop Stockholm-like sympathies for their traffickers and become dependent on them for food and shelter or addicted to drugs and alcohol. Whatever the reasons, about 5 percent of survivors report that they were trafficked again. Virtually all who were trafficked a second time report the type of trafficking they experienced in the second episode was the same as the first.

As illustrated in Figure 24, women are far more likely to be repeat victims of trafficking than men. Members of the K’iche community, by contrast, report significantly lower levels of repeat trafficking than other ethnic groups. Survivors of labor trafficking and slavery are the most likely of the various types of survivors to be trafficked a second time. Despite the frequency with which women are trafficked a second time, no one in the survey who initially was sexually exploited fell victim to sex trafficking a second time.

Predictably, better educated and relatively wealthier individuals were less likely to be repeat victims of trafficking (data not shown). The survey did not collect data on the circumstances surrounding the second victimization. Given the very small numbers of repeat victims, more fine-grained analyses cannot be undertaken.
Trafficking survivors express ambivalence about the assistance they received from their families and communities after their victimization ended. Only about 40 percent of survivors report that their family provided a ‘lot of help’; a bare majority received any help at all from family (see Figure 25).
Community help was even more limited. Fewer than 25 percent of survivors say they received assistance from the community after their ordeal. The community reaction, however, appears to have been one more of ignorance or apathy than of stigmatization or blame. When asked whether their community blamed them for what happened or viewed them as innocent victims, only 13 percent of survivors report that they felt stigmatized by the community. Thirty-eight percent say they were accepted by their town as innocent victims. However, the largest percentage of survivors (49%) say that they were neither blamed nor accepted by the community.

There are modest differences between the victims of labor and sex trafficking in terms of their communities’ responses to their return as shown in Figure 26. A plurality of labor victims report that they were viewed as victims when they returned to their community and were rarely stigmatized. Sex trafficking victims are no more likely to be blamed or stigmatized, but they are substantially less likely to be viewed as victims. One possibility is that sex trafficking survivors are less open than labor victims about their experiences as victims, whether because they are more embarrassed about the experience or more fearful of what the community reaction might be. Either way the community appears more indifferent to sex trafficking victims or simply less aware of the victimization.

When asked about specific services they received when trafficking ended, very few survivors say they received even basic assistance. Only about a quarter of survivors report receiving medical help after their ordeal and even fewer received legal assistance, shelter, psychological help or protection from their former traffickers (Figure 27). When survivors did receive one of the services they were much more likely to receive others as well (not shown). This means that a few lucky survivors get a full complement of services; most, unfortunately, receive none. When survivors do receive services, they are generally
satisfied with the help they received. Large majorities give high marks to the medical care and housing they received. They report they are least satisfied with the psychological services received, although very few are provided such services.

Figure 27: Survivor Receipt of and Satisfaction with Post-Trafficking Assistance

G. Understanding Different Types of Trafficking

Figure 28 profiles the five most common forms of human trafficking in Guatemala. It summarizes their essential characteristics and shows in what ways different types of trafficking are similar and in what ways they are different. It reinforces the point that human trafficking in Guatemala is dominated by labor trafficking. Even among women the risks of labor trafficking are more than twice as high as sex trafficking. Human trafficking in Guatemala is widespread, but poorly educated, adolescent, Ladino males from bad neighborhoods are at greatest risk. Labor trafficking is a family affair; it is perpetrated on victims mostly by parents and other family members with little apparent involvement from bad actors such as drug gangs, coyote or recruiters.

Sex trafficking overwhelmingly victimizes Ladino women in Guatemala. It is the shortest-lasting form of trafficking, but also one of the most odious and reprehensible as reflected in the 0% recidivism rate for sex trafficking. The typical sex trafficking victim is a young adult, poorly educated from a poor neighborhood who is victimized by her family including her father, mother, and husband – or her boyfriend if she is not married. Although sex trafficking can involve minors, this appears from the evidence to be far less prevalent than conventional wisdom holds.
What victims describe as slavery is harder to profile and probably encompasses a multitude of different experiences. Nevertheless, based on the patterns of responses, we believe that it is used either as a euphemism for sex trafficking or, in the K’iche community, to describe young women forced to work as housekeepers. The typical victim of slavery is an adolescent woman from the K’iche community who was exploited by her family and who escaped the ordeal after a relatively short period.

| Figure 28: Profiles of Different Types of Human Trafficking Victims in Guatemala |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                             | Labor                      | Sexual                       | Slavery                     | Forced Marriage             | Forced Begging              |
| Prevalence                  | 88%                        | 15%                          | 7%                          | 5%                          | 2%                          |
|                             | Much lower for K’iche      | but twice that for Women     | But higher among Women      | Slightly Higher Among Men   | Higher among Women          |
| Most at Risk                | Adolescent Ladino Men      | Young Adult Ladino Women     | K’iche Girls                | Adolescent Other than K’iche Indigenous | Ladino Girls |
| Average Age                 | 17                         | 22                          | 17                          | 14                          | 10                          |
| Average Duration (Years)    | 5                          | 3                           | 4                           | 10                          | 8                           |
| Recidivism                  | 5%                         | 0%                          | 4%                          | 0%                          | 0%                          |
| Who is Blamed               | Family and Friends         | Overwhelmingly Family        | Family, Friends and Bad Actors | Overwhelmingly Family       | Overwhelmingly Family       |
| How it Ended                | Escape                     | Escape                      | Escape                      | Rescue by Family Still in Marriage | ‘Rescue’ by Family         |

There is considerable debate as to whether forced marriage is properly defined as human trafficking, but it is classified as such by Guatemalan law. It also is clearly a human rights violation whether it is trafficking or not. Forced marriage may be the most idiosyncratic of the major types of trafficking, not least because it affects men and women about equally. The typical victim is an adolescent from a non-K’iche indigenous group, whose family has arranged the marriage. The typical marriage lasts for ten years, although this probably underestimates the duration given that a number of victims in the survey were still in their marriages at the time of the survey. Although parents are implicated in most forced marriages, families also provide victims’ best hope for escaping such marriages. Parents, we assume,
may feel some responsibility for the marriages they arrange and are sometimes willing to step in to rescue the child if the marriage appears to be a bad one.

Forced begging is a relatively minor form of trafficking based on the survey. The typical beggar is a Ladino girl who spends nearly a decade of her life in the trade, exploited by parents. She reports being rescued from begging by her family, but since they were the ones exploiting her, this likely means that her parents released her from begging when she became too old to be effective. The data on begging contradict the evidence visible on every street corner in Guatemala City where begging is endemic. It is likely that young children do not view forced begging as coercive in the context of family life where parental discipline is the norm and do not associate begging with human trafficking since it is not mentioned specifically in the Palermo definition. In all likelihood the survey substantially underestimates the extent of begging and other early childhood forms of trafficking.

III. PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF TRAFFICKING

Prevention is the first “P” in the “4P” counter-trafficking paradigm (prevention, protection, prosecution, and partnerships) intended to combat human trafficking. Increasing public knowledge and awareness of trafficking is the centerpiece of most prevention activities. The underlying assumption is that educating the public regarding the dangers of trafficking, the individual behaviors that put people at risk of being trafficked, and the resources available to assist people avoid victimization will enable individuals to avoid the risks of being trafficked. USAID/Guatemala and the Government of Guatemala have both invested heavily in programs designed to increase public knowledge and awareness of trafficking.

A. The Limits of Public Awareness of Trafficking

To assess the public’s knowledge and awareness of trafficking, the Guatemala C-TIP Survey included a battery of questions probing individuals’ understandings. The questions were placed at the start of the survey to insure that responses to the knowledge and awareness questions were not influenced by the extensive battery of questions asked later in the survey about respondents’ human trafficking experiences.

Specifically, the survey begins, “We have heard some discussion recently about what some people refer to as ‘Human Trafficking’ [Trata]. Have you heard anything about this?” Shortly after it follows up by asking, “Are you aware of Article 202, Guatemala’s human trafficking law that began in 2009?”

The responses to these simple questions reported in Figure 29 are discouraging; most Guatemalans have never heard about trafficking and also have never heard of the law that defines and punishes trafficking. When asked most broadly if they have heard of the term “trata” (human trafficking), only 36 percent of Guatemalans between the ages of 15 and 45 replied affirmatively. Even fewer (about 6 percent) say than have heard specifically of Article 202, although enactment of the legislation was a signature issue for the Vice President of Guatemala and had been widely publicized. Fewer than forty percent of Guatemalans have heard of either.
The minority of respondents who indicated that they had heard of trafficking were subsequently asked an open-ended question about the definition of trafficking. The question produced a jumble of responses, most of which indicated that most people know that human trafficking refers to bad things but do not have very meaningful ideas of what those are or how they differ from other social ‘bads’. Indicative of the lack of knowledge, only 338 people out of the approximately 1800 who say they have heard of trafficking offered any sort of definition.

Of the 300+ definitions that were offered, a significant number mention forced labor, forced prostitution, and other acts which clearly qualify human trafficking. However, an equally large number mention social ills or bad acts which clearly do not qualify as trafficking under Palermo. The following were randomly selected from the 338 definitions that respondents offered and are reproduced, here, verbatim as recorded by the enumerators (as is often the case with open ended responses in the surveys, a number of responses make little sense either because the respondent was inarticulate or the enumerator had difficulty recording the answer):

- A terrorist phase and to convince young people and to fool them
- Abuse, maltreatment, surpass in everything a person
- Exploitation of a worker
- Forcing women and young women into prostitution
- In the literal sense is abuse of persons and physical maltreatment
- Is to dominate women into making things for their father or women mistreatment
It to violate the rights of other persons
Kidnaping in exchange of money
Maltreatment, family violence
Manipulation done to people into force labor r sexually
Negotiation of women against their will
People do it with the interest of obtaining money without caring for the suffering of others
People of lower socio economic status unjustly treated and for racism and the color
Robbery of kids
To deprive of freedom and rights to a person
To have a good relation with people but manipulating them
To take or sell another person, to lie about a work, to force a woman to prostitute
Using someone as a mule to take drugs by kidnaping them
Using someone to traffic their organs
Using someone for forced labor

To the extent that respondents correctly identify trafficking, they are about equally likely to identify it as involving forced sex as forced labor. To the extent that definitions identify the sex of victims, trafficking victims are most likely to be identified as women or children. Interestingly ethnicity almost never appears in the definitions of trafficking volunteered by respondents.

To better assess the extent of human trafficking knowledge, all respondents, whether or not they had heard of trafficking, were given brief vignettes describing thirteen different situations and asked whether each one was, or was not an example of trafficking:

There are different ideas about what human trafficking is and is not. For each of the following situations, please tell us whether you consider it to be an example of human trafficking or not.

A. A person is paid by gangs to smuggle drugs across the border and is caught and imprisoned by the police.
B. A person goes abroad voluntarily and works illegally at a factory for long hours and low wages.
C. A person is offered an agricultural job outside of Guatemala but is told on arrival that there is no job and they must return home.
D. A child is kidnapped from her parents, and adopted by a family in the U.S. that did not know that she was kidnapped and sold.
E. A child is forced to work in the fields with his parents rather than go to school.
F. A pregnant woman stays in a “maternity home,” that offer to pay her delivery expenses in exchange for light housekeeping. Afterwards the home presents her with an impossible bill, which they would waive if she signs away her baby.
G. A person is recruited to work in the fields but there is little work and the cost of room and board means he is in debt to the employer and is forbidden from leaving without paying.

H. A man hires a coyote to take him to the U.S. for work but is kidnapped by a gang in Mexico and forced to join them.

I. A woman is recruited to work in a nursing job but upon arrival is forced to do house work.

J. A 22 year old girl is lured by her boyfriend into working as a prostitute for his financial benefit.

K. An immigrant to Guatemala from another country is recruited for a job in a maquiladora but on arrival is locked up and has to work 12-18 hours a day with little to no pay.

L. Parents are paid by a woman who takes their baby to the city to beg for money, returning the baby to the parents afterwards.

M. A 14 year old girl is lured by her boyfriend into working as a prostitute for his financial benefit.

The items were randomized in the survey so that the order in which they were presented was in no particular order and different for each respondent. As they are arranged here, however, the first three situations (A-C), bad though they may be for the affected individual, clearly do not meet the definition of human trafficking. The last seven situations (G-M) are clearly consistent with the Palermo definition, whereas the three middle situations (D-F) may or may not meet the definition of trafficking depending on the context in which they occur.

Figure 30 reports the percentages of respondents who identify each of the situations as human trafficking. Consistent with the open ended responses, the data show that Guatemalans have at least some general sense, however vague, of what is and is not human trafficking. Overall, the most clear cut examples of trafficking are identified as such by more than three-quarters of respondents. Just as clearly, however, citizens tend to define all human ills as trafficking. More than 60 percent of respondents mis-categorize all of the non-trafficking situations as trafficking. Also apparent is the tendency to associate trafficking with women and children. Six of the seven situations that are most widely identified as trafficking involve women and children. The exception is the situation where illegal immigrants to Guatemala are locked in a factory and forced to work.

Overall respondents correctly identify 63 percent of the ten unambiguous cases (including the seven situations which are clearly trafficking and and the three which are clearly not). Since a series of coin flips would correctly identify an average of 50 percent of the trafficking situations purely by chance, the 63 percent figure represents only a 13 percentage point improvement in identifying trafficking situations compared to random guessing.
Figure 31 looks at this from a different perspective showing the number of alternatives (0 to 10) that respondents correctly identify. It shows that 25% of respondents correctly identify five of the ten situations.
situations – the same number that one should get right simply by flipping a coin ten times or guessing. Another thirteen percent get six of the ten correct which is a minor improvement over guessing. The largest group 40%) correctly identifies sev of the ten vignettes and show a modest amount of knowledge. The remaining 25 percent do better but only 2 percent correctly identify all ten.

The U.S. Department of State’s Trafficking in Person’s Report identifies Guatemala as a source, transit, and destination country for trafficking. As a further test of Guatemalans’ knowledge of trafficking we asked respondents how Guatemala is affected by trafficking and asked them to check all of the following options that they thought applied:

a. Guatemala is a country of origin - people are trafficked from Guatemala to work in other countries such as Mexico and the United States
b. Guatemala is a destination country - people from other countries are trafficked to Guatemala
c. Guatemala is a transit country - people are trafficked from other countries, through Guatemala to Mexico and the United States
d. Guatemala has internal human trafficking - people from Guatemala are trafficked internally within Guatemala

Although all four of the options are correct, few respondents are aware of this as shown in Figure 32. The largest percentage of respondents correctly answers that Guatemala suffers from internal trafficking. But, given that these categories ask only for a yes/no response, 50 percent should get each item right simply by guessing. Worse, only 43% correctly identify Guatemala as a destination country.
Overall, less than a quarter of respondents correctly identify all four types of trafficking in their country. Clearly, most Guatemalans have little awareness or real knowledge about human trafficking either in general terms or with respect to trafficking in Guatemala in particular.

B. Who is Aware and Knowledgeable about Trafficking?

There is considerable variation, of course, in the extent of knowledge and awareness about trafficking. Figure 33 begins to explore the correlates. It measures TIP awareness simply as the percentage who self-report being aware of human trafficking in general or of Article 202 in particular. Trafficking knowledge is measured as the percentage of the ten unambiguous trafficking situations which people identify correctly. Awareness is a more subjective measure, while knowledge is more objective. That the two measures produce very similar results for different sub-groups speaks to the robustness of the results.

Given the emphasis on promoting knowledge and awareness as a counter-trafficking strategy, it is disturbing to observe that groups with higher knowledge and awareness of trafficking are the same groups previously observed to have higher percentages of trafficking victims. Men have significantly higher trafficking awareness (but not knowledge) than women. Their greater awareness however has not protected them from becoming victims of trafficking. As noted previously, men are slightly more likely to have been trafficking victims than women despite their greater awareness of trafficking.

Urban residents have significantly more knowledge and awareness of trafficking and significantly higher victimization rates. The same is true with regard to ethnicity: Ladinos have more knowledge and
awareness and higher trafficking rates. Age (in this case, the current age of respondents) shows a curvilinear relationship. Knowledge and awareness are lower in the youngest and highest current age groups and higher in the two middle age groups.

This is not to suggest a cause and effect relationship between knowledge or awareness and the likelihood of being trafficked. Among other limitations, it is impossible to determine from the current data whether knowledge and awareness preceeded or followed victimization. The relationship almost certainly is reciprocal but the strength of the reciprocal effects cannot be determined. Still, the evidence runs contrary to expectations and, at minimum, suggests the need to consider more closely the widespread assumption that more knowledge and awareness of trafficking makes people safer and less likely to engage in risky behavior.

The results in Figure 34 are somewhat more reassuring. We previously observed that the least educated citizens were most likely to be trafficked (albeit with exceptions), and Figure 34 confirms that less educated citizens are significantly less aware of or knowledgeable about human trafficking. Indeed, the relationship is among the strongest in the data. Less affluent Guatemalans also are less knowledgeable and aware of trafficking and previously were seen to have higher victimization rates. Also consistent with the knowledge and awareness hypothesis, unmarried individuals are least likely to be trafficked and exhibit the greatest TIP knowledge and awareness.

Figure 34: Knowledge and Awareness of Trafficking Disaggregated by Education, Income and Marital Status

Figure 35 continues in this vein looking at the relationship between other kinds of victimization and human trafficking knowledge and awareness. Contrary to the knowledge and awareness hypothesis, victims of crime and discrimination are generally more knowledgeable and aware of human trafficking.
than the average citizen but more likely to be human trafficking victims nonetheless. The only exceptions are hitting victims and those forced to work by their families as children, neither of whom differs from others in their human trafficking awareness.

Human trafficking survivors, not surprisingly, are significantly more likely to be aware of trafficking although their knowledge of trafficking in no different than non-victims. Importantly, the knowledge and awareness of victims is measured in the survey after they were victimized. It does not necessarily reflect their knowledge and awareness at the time they were trafficked. The experience of being trafficked likely contributes to increased knowledge and awareness, although it is interesting that human trafficking victims’ knowledge of trafficking (62%) is almost identical to that of the average citizen. Interesting, for reasons that cannot be determined in the data, knowing a victim is much more strongly correlated with trafficking knowledge and awareness than being a victim.

Multivariate analyses (OLS regressions), summarized in Figures 36 and 37, provide more rigorous evidence of these relationships. All of the variables examined in the Figures 32-35 are included in the analyses along with a number of others hypothesized as being potentially important. To conserve space, both tables report only statistically significant relationships.\(^{31}\)

With regard to awareness, the results confirm the importance of formal education whose influence on trafficking awareness is almost twice that of any other factor (Figure 36). Income also has a substantial

\(^{31}\) The regression models fit the data reasonably well and account for 16% of the variance in human trafficking awareness and 14% of the variance in human trafficking knowledge.
independent and additive effect. Together these confirm the importance of socio-economic status on trafficking awareness.

The same general patterns are observed with regard to trafficking knowledge (Figure 37). More educated and affluent citizens have greater knowledge and awareness and are less likely to be trafficked. What isn’t clear, however, is whether these relationships are evidence of cause and effect or simply a result of more affluent people living in circumstances where trafficking is less likely.

Skepticism of the prophylactic benefits of trafficking awareness is reinforced by the evidence that Ladinos, men, urban residents and those who live in neighborhoods where they are exposed to crime, violence, and the presence of trafficking victims/survivors are significantly more knowledgeable and aware of human trafficking and also are at significantly greater risk of being trafficked. In other words, even in the multivariate model the evidence of the relationship between trafficking victimization and trafficking knowledge and awareness is mixed.

There are various possible explanations for this inconsistent pattern. One is the possibility that the there is a causal relationship between knowledge/awareness and victimization but that the causal arrow goes both ways and with opposite effects. Knowledge and awareness may reduce the likelihood of being trafficked but being trafficked may increase the likelihood of being knowledgeable. The problem with this interpretation is that being a victim of trafficking is not a significant predictor of either knowledge or awareness in Figures 36 and 37. Knowing a trafficking victim makes a difference; being a trafficking victim does not.
A second possibility is that the relationship between knowledge/awareness and victimization is conditional and depends either on the type of trafficking or on its context in ways that are not clear from this analysis. A third and more credible possibility is that the relationship between victimization and knowledge/awareness is very weak, if not spurious, and that both knowledge/awareness and victimization are joint products of other factors that make them appear to be causally related even when they are not. In support of this interpretation, the inclusion of the knowledge and awareness variables in the Logit analysis predicting trafficking victimizations (previously summarized in Figure 11) does not significantly improve its overall fit to the data and neither variable is statistically significant in predicting victimization.

![Figure 37: Who is Most Knowledgable About Human Trafficking?](image)

Interestingly, knowledge and awareness of trafficking are linked not only to respondents’ backgrounds and neighborhoods but also to their attitudes and beliefs. For example ‘moral traditionalism,’ or the idea that society would be better off holding onto traditional moral values rather than accepting the moral relativism of today, has strong positive effects on both knowledge and awareness of human trafficking. Similarly, individuals with stronger feelings of personal control have significantly higher knowledge and awareness. Religiosity and a commitment to women’s rights on the other hand are associated with lower levels of knowledge and awareness. More generally this means that knowledge

---

32 The concept is measured with three agree/disagree question: “The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to these changes” (disagree); the country would have fewer problems if there was more emphasis on traditional family ties” (agree); and “There is too much sexual freedom and loose living these days” (agree).
and awareness of human trafficking are somewhat higher in individuals with more conservative values and somewhat lower among those with more liberal views.

Finally, it is interesting to observe what variables do not influence knowledge and awareness of trafficking. Most obvious in this regard is the limited impact on trafficking knowledge and awareness exhibited by trafficking survivors. Members of civil society organizations (CSOs) also do not exhibit greater knowledge and awareness of trafficking despite the emphasis accorded them in counter-trafficking programming. This includes membership in women’s CSOs, although the number of women claiming membership in such organizations is very small and the data are of limited reliability as a result.

**Figure 38: Knowledge About Human Trafficking Across Guatemala Departments**

Another way of assessing the relationship between knowledge/awareness and trafficking victimization is by comparing the map of human trafficking hot-spots in Figure 10 with the map in Figure 38 showing variations in the level of public knowledge about trafficking (measured as the percentage of the 10 unambiguous trafficking vignettes correctly identified).
The map confirms that knowledge about human trafficking varies considerably across different areas of Guatemala. The relationship to the distribution of trafficking victims, however, is tenuous. Trafficking hot spots previously observed include Guatemala City (although not the department as a whole), Chiquimula, Petén, and Sacatepéquez. The map in Figure 38 shows that knowledge of trafficking is relatively low in Sacatepéquez and Chiquimula, but it is high in Petén and in Guatemala City (not shown on Map). Moreover, trafficking knowledge is lowest in Zacapa, where there are very few trafficking victims. The geographic correlation between knowledge and victimization is no stronger than that observed among individuals. More generally, knowledge about trafficking is lowest in the central and northwest regions of the country. They are highest in the south, the southeast and north.

C. Public Beliefs about Trafficking

The evidence thus far indicates that most citizens in Guatemala are not very aware of human trafficking and have only vague ideas about what trafficking is. The lack of knowledge and awareness, however, does not prevent people from having a variety of attitudes and beliefs about trafficking which can have significant effects on their personal behavior and as well as on the counter-trafficking policies they think government should pursue. In this regard the survey asked respondents a series of questions about citizens’ perceptions of the scope of the trafficking problem in Guatemala, where they personally obtained most their information about trafficking, how they think people become victims, and the risk of being trafficked facing the members of different groups.

To assist respondents in answering these questions, they were given a card which contained the Palermo definition of human trafficking expressed in laypersons’ language. The card was read out loud and respondents kept this card afterwards giving them easy access to the definition for the rest of the interview. The reverse side of the cards also contained contact information for several government agencies and NGOs that provide protection and assistance to trafficking victims and survivors.

Despite the low levels of knowledge and awareness of trafficking, citizens express deep concern with the problem when the Palermo definition is read to them. More than 85 percent react to the definition by saying that trafficking is a big problem in Guatemala; nine percent think it’s a moderate problem. Fewer than five percent think it is only a slight problem or not a problem at all (data not shown).

Not many people have heard of trafficking or have much information about it, so when they are asked where they obtain most of their information about trafficking, their responses are likely highly generic. They probably reflect where citizens get information about issues generically and not just about trafficking. It is not surprising, therefore, that most people report that they get most of their information about trafficking from television (Figure 39). More than three-quarters of respondents list it as one of their sources, almost twice as many as mention radio, the second most frequent source. Interestingly interpersonal communication plays relatively little role, whether by word of mouth or via the internet. Community leaders have almost no visibility as sources of trafficking information, and almost no one admits to learning about trafficking from personal experience.
Figure 39: Where do People get Information about Trafficking?

Percentages total more than 100%

Figure 40: Perceptions of the Principal Reasons that People become Trafficking Victims.
Citizens blame the trafficking overwhelmingly either on victims’ lack of information about trafficking or on the economic distress faced by victims and their families. Figure 40 disaggregates the data by age and sex and shows how survivors’ responses compare to those of other respondents. Overall, nearly 60 percent of respondents blame a lack of information for trafficking; 39 percent blame unemployment, and 34 percent blame poor wages (two responses were allowed so numbers total more than 100 percent). By comparison, very few people blame reckless behavior on the part of victims. Fewer still blame weak laws or discrimination based either on gender or ethnicity. A small but significant number of individuals blame pressure from the family.

Young women (15-17) are more likely than others to blame trafficking on the lack of information. Adults (both men and women) are more likely than minors to blame trafficking on economic circumstances. Minors, especially girls, are more likely to blame family pressures and the reckless behavior of victims. Survivors of trafficking, however, are less likely than others to blame trafficking on an absence of information and are relatively more likely to blame economic pressures.

Respondents also were asked to evaluate the risks of being trafficked faced by a variety of different sub-groups “on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 means there is no risk at all and 10 means that there is extreme risk that a person will be trafficked.” The sub-groups (which were listed in random order) were: Adult women, Adolescent women, Girls, Adult men, Adolescent men, Boys, Illegal immigrants and Indigenous people.
As shown in Figure 41, most respondents think everyone in Guatemala is at substantial risk of being trafficked. The perceived risk of being trafficked across all groups is 7.9 on a 10 point scale with 5.5 as the mid-point. Consistent with the conventional wisdom, respondents perceive young girls and adolescent women to be most vulnerable to trafficking, although the previous data on trafficking victims suggest that adolescent men are actually slightly more at risk than adolescent women or girls. Illegal migrants and indigenous peoples are considered the groups most at risk after young women, although the data show that Ladinos face somewhat greater risk in practice. Adult men are perceived as least vulnerable by a substantial margin, although even men are perceived as being substantially at risk with an average risk score of 6.4.

To better understand how different Guatemalans perceive the risks of trafficking, Figure 42 summarizes the results of a multivariate analysis (OLS regression) that estimates the average risk that each individual respondent assigns to the different subgroups of Guatemalans (see Figure 41) on the ten-point risk scale. This is not the risk that respondents feel they personally face, it is the risk of trafficking that they think the average citizen in Guatemala faces.

![Figure 42: What Explains Perceptions of Human Trafficking Risks?](Standardized Regression Coefficients)

The figure includes only statistically significant influences. It clearly shows that women as whole perceive the highest risks of trafficking in Guatemala. Importantly, people with greater knowledge about trafficking also see higher risks from trafficking. In this sense, increasing knowledge (although not awareness) may make citizens more conscious of the risks and possibly more cautious as a result. Older citizens also are more concerned about the risks as are those with a greater sense of personal control.
Both higher income and education also are related to lower perceptions of trafficking risks. This, however, may be less of a cause and effect relationship than a simple function of the fact that wealthy, better educated individuals are personally significantly less at risk from trafficking given the nature of their occupations and affluent life styles. Those who are members of civil society organizations also perceive lower risks, which is likely a function of their higher social status positions as well. Former victims of trafficking and those who have been victims of violence have slightly higher assessments of the risks from trafficking, although probably less than would be expected, given the experiences they have had. Finally, rural residents do not perceive as much risk from trafficking as those who live in the cities which also reflects reality.

Interestingly those who work away from home and, therefore, are most at risk of being trafficked are very clearly aware of the risk. Their decisions to work away from home despite knowing the risks provide evidence that risk awareness by itself is not sufficient to prevent risky behavior. Individuals who work away from home either believe that the risks do not apply to themselves, personally, or that their economic circumstances simply don’t give them any choice except to accept the risks in order to survive.

Again, it is instructive to consider the factors that are not associated with different perceptions of risk. These include ethnicity, religion and religiosity, marital status, and most attitudes and values such as moral traditionalism, attitudes toward women’s equality, attitudes about prostitution, and perceptions of discrimination. While most of these factors are correlated with perceptions of trafficking risks, the analysis suggests that their relationships to perceived risks are mediated through other influences such as gender, trafficking knowledge and working away from home.

A series of identical analyses (not shown) were conducted with regard to the perceived risks which people assign to each of the age and gender subgroups (girls, adolescent girls, adult women, etc.). The patterns are highly consistent. The most obvious difference is that individuals tend to have lower estimates of the risks for their own subgroup than for others. Thus, adult women assess the risks to others as being somewhat higher than the risk to themselves. This is true for both young women and men as well as illegal migrants and indigenous peoples. Similarly respondents under 18 years old assess the risks to themselves somewhat lower than adults do.

**D. Public Attitudes on Combatting Trafficking and Assisting Victim**

Survey respondents also were asked about the steps they think government should take to combat human trafficking in Guatemala. First, they were asked very broadly how important they think it is for government to catch and punish human trafficking perpetrators (prosecution) and how important it is for government to inform and warn potential victims (prevention). As shown in Figure 43, a clear majority (58 percent) think that it is extremely important for government to pursue human traffickers. Another 32 percent say it is very important while only 12 percent say it is only moderately or slightly important. A slightly smaller, but still overwhelming, percentage think it is important for government to inform and warn potential victims. Almost 85 percent say it is very or extremely important; only 16 percent disagrees.
When asked more specifically which counter-trafficking strategies would be most effective, the great majority of citizens endorse any and all strategies that might be undertaken (Figure 44). Public preferences in these regards are broadly consistent with public judgments of the causes of trafficking previously discussed (see previous Figure 40). More than 60 percent of citizens think programs designed to keep children in school would be ‘extremely effective’ in fighting trafficking and another 30 percent say it would be ‘very effective’.

Similarly, almost 90 percent of respondents think providing youth with more information about trafficking would be very or extremely effective. Improving economic conditions and providing jobs is a close third in importance followed by stricter laws and stronger penalties for trafficking. Smaller but still substantial majorities think focusing on drug gangs would be effective while the smallest majorities favor prosecuting ‘those who solicit prostitutes’ and tightening the border to limit migration. The differences in support for the different options, however, are misleading. Large majorities favor all of the options. The public’s clear message regarding counter-trafficking policy is simply, “do something;” in fact, “do anything and everything that might conceivably work.”

The same ‘any and all’ response is provided by respondents when asked what sorts of services they think that government should provide to survivors of trafficking (see Figure 45). The public overwhelmingly favors having the government provide survivors with access to medical care, legal services, shelter, and reintegration services. They also want survivors protected from retribution and prosecuting trafficking perpetrators. In fact, support for these services is virtually unanimous.
Figure 44: Public Support for Various Counter-trafficking Strategies
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Figure 45 Percent Favoring Government Services For Human Trafficking Victims
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Finally, we asked Guatemalans who they thought they could trust most to help them or someone close to them if they became victims of trafficking (Figure 46). Trust in most institutions is low. On average only 38% of respondents express trust in the eight institutions. Citizens have serious concerns about human trafficking and are convinced that not enough is being done to combat it. There is little trust for most institutions as a result.

Surprisingly, people are most likely to express trust in the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman, and by a substantial margin (61% vs 50% for the next most trusted institution, the police). We suspect, but cannot demonstrate with the data available, that this is due to low levels of public knowledge about the Ombudsman’s office and the social desirability attached to the term, human rights, which together give people a positive feeling about the little-known Ombudsman’s office.

Also surprising for different reasons is the relatively high level of trust enjoyed by the police. Although the conventional wisdom in Guatemala is that people are wary of the police, who many accuse of taking bribes and otherwise abusing their positions, the evidence here is that the police are among the most trusted institutions at least with regard to helping human trafficking victims. Indeed, people trust the police even more than their own families. Combined with the earlier evidence (Figure 19) that virtually none of the trafficking survivors in the survey think that the police were complicit in their being trafficked, the portrait of the police provided by citizens is unexpectedly positive. This is not the case for the military, however, soldiers are only half as likely to be trusted as the police, and are among the least trusted groups in the survey.
Family is the third most trusted institution in the survey. Nevertheless, it is surprising that family does not register even higher on trust in absolute terms. Fewer than half of respondents say they would trust their families to help them if they were victims of trafficking. This could be a function of respondents’ perceptions that their families have few resources with which to help. It also could be a function, at least in part of the large number of trafficking survivors who say that family played a significant role in their being trafficked in the first place.

Government institutions score relatively high on trust compared to most social institutions. In addition to the trust expressed in the Ombudsman and police, about 40 percent of citizens express trust in judges, lawyers, municipal officials and the Procuraduria General de la Nation.

In contrast, barely a third of respondents think they could trust a minister or priest for help if they were trafficked. Even smaller percentages would trust NGOs, medical doctors or nurses. Most surprising, perhaps, only 20 percent say they could trust a teacher for help. Again, this may reflect people’s assessments that there is not much that teachers could do to help – not that teachers would not try.

Examination of the variation in trust varies across different sub-group suggests that trust is only marginally affected by people’s attitudes toward, or experiences with human trafficking. The multivariate analysis (OLS Regression) in Figure 47 suggests that trust is mostly a function of individuals’ broader ideologies and perspectives on society.

**Figure 47: Sources of Trust in Those who Could Help Human Trafficking Victims**
For example, having a religious identity is among the strongest predictors of trust – which is interesting given the low levels of trust in the church to help victims. Indeed, Evangelical Protestants and Catholics are two of the groups with the highest levels of trust across the eleven institutions. Conservative views on traditional moral values and women’s rights also are positively related to trust and contribute to the idea that trust is itself a conservative value. Feeling physically secure and having a strong sense of personal control also contribute significantly to trust. Interestingly, age and education have strong negative effects on trust; the longer respondents have lived and the more they know the less likely they are to trust these institutions.

 Trafficking survivors, in contrast, are modestly but significantly more likely to trust both political and social institutions to help human trafficking survivors. This is interesting because of the evidence, previously discussed, that human trafficking survivors receive little help from anyone other than family in escaping trafficking, and not very much from their families either.

 It also is important to note what does not affect trust, including sex, ethnicity, income, perceptions of discrimination, knowledge about human trafficking, and knowing someone who has been trafficked.

**E. The Knowledge of C-TIP Experts**

Eight to ten percent of Guatemalans by our estimates have been victims of human trafficking. About the same percentage have family, friends, or neighbors who have been trafficked, and upwards of half of all Guatemalans worked as children in situations that at least border on trafficking. Despite the prevalence of trafficking in Guatemala, most citizens have heard very little about the issue or know much about it. Knowledge and awareness of trafficking vary widely across different groups in society, although as this report highlights, even the most informed sub-groups have only limited information in absolute terms.

Counter-trafficking specialists in Guatemala are certainly aware of and concerned about the human trafficking. However, qualitative interviews conducted at the start of this project suggest that C-TIP experts also harbor important misconceptions about the nature of the trafficking problem. Some of this likely reflects the absence of systematic and reliable evidence. Some of it also may reflect personal or political agendas.

We have seen, for example, that the conventional wisdom of experts about the location of trafficking hotspots in Guatemala is partly right, which is to say it is also partly wrong. Although experts correctly recognize that trafficking is concentrated in lower SES areas of Guatemala City, they overestimate its prevalence along the Mexican border, in the agricultural south and along traditional drug smuggling routes. In conversations with more than 40 trafficking experts in Guatemala in 2013, Petén and Chiquimula, which have the highest concentrations of trafficking survivors, were never mentioned, even once, as likely hotspots.

Experts also do not appear to be aware that trafficking affects the Ladino community as much or more than indigenous communities or that men suffer as frequently or slightly more than women. Some of
this reflects the intense focus on sex trafficking both by the GoG and by much of the donor and NGO community, including USAID. It also reflects the understandable focus of donor groups on marginalized communities including indigenous groups and the poor. Our conversations with local experts made clear that many (though certainly not all) are aware that labor trafficking is more widespread than sex trafficking. However, sex-trafficking receives far more attention in discussions with local experts and, we presume, in policy and program development as well. Sex trafficking clearly is a serious, substantial and heinous problem, but labor trafficking is a much wider problem, for women as well as men, and for children too. Among C-TIP experts, however, labor trafficking is substantially neglected.

Expert opinions about trafficking in Guatemala also appear to overestimate the extent to which Guatemalans are trafficked outside the country. The percentage of Guatemalans who travel abroad for work is very small – well under five percent of the population. Working abroad is a major risk factor for being trafficked, but those trafficked abroad comprise a very small percentage of trafficking victims currently living in Guatemala contrary to elite perceptions.  

C-TIP experts in Guatemala further overestimate the extent to which trafficking is perpetrated by “bad actors” such as drug gangs, coyotes, recruiters and even unscrupulous boyfriends. As a consequence, they underestimate the critical roles played by family members and friends. Bad actors certainly exist. They clearly play important roles in trafficking and may play especially large roles in some of the nastiest forms of sex trafficking. Still, the evidence clearly shows that trafficking in Guatemala is more personal than professional. Fathers, mothers, husbands and other relatives are the principal perpetrators of human trafficking driven more by economic desperation and necessity than by personal avarice or greed.

IV. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The Human Trafficking Narrative: Fact and Fiction

Human trafficking in Guatemala is widespread and apparently undiminished in recent years despite more than a decade of coordinated counter-trafficking efforts by the governments of Guatemala and the United States in addition to a wide variety of other domestic and international C-TIP advocacy and social service groups. Several different measures of the prevalence of human trafficking used in the survey converge on an estimate that about eight to ten percent of Guatemalan citizens have been victims of some form of trafficking at some point in their lives. The evidence suggests that the rate at which Guatemalans have been trafficked has remained largely unchanged over the past twenty years. Trafficking in Guatemala arguably is even worse than the statistics indicate since the survey-based estimates do not fully account for some exploitative forms of child labor. They also do not fully account for illegal adoptions or forced marriages. Nor do they account for those who may have been forced to

33 It is possible that many of those trafficked abroad do not return to Guatemala. They may perish in captivity or escape but never return home. Nevertheless, the percentage of people who report ever working abroad in any capacity is very low, and this sets a low upper-bound on the level of possible out-of-country victimization.
serve as child soldiers during the civil war or who may have been forced or enticed into selling bodily organs.

Importantly, the extent of forced prostitution of other forms of sexual exploitation may be especially likely to be underestimated in the survey given the sensitivity of the subject and the reluctance of victims to report these experiences in the survey. The failure of the list experiments with respect to measuring sexual exploitation are especially troubling in this regard.

Trafficking, though widespread, is far from being equally distributed. It is clearly concentrated within society’s lower strata, among the poor and poorly educated and among the young. Trafficking is one of a number of interrelated social ills, along with other forms of crime and violence, which contribute to the bad neighborhoods in which so many of the poor reside.

That said trafficking affects men as much as or slightly more than women, although in somewhat different ways. Trafficking also is mostly unrelated to language or ethnicity in Guatemala. Poor Ladinos are trafficked at the same or slightly higher rates than the poor in indigenous communities. The urban poor suffer as much or slightly more than the rural poor.

Despite the focus on sex trafficking by counter-trafficking specialists, labor trafficking is much more prevalent. Even allowing for the possibility that the true level of sex trafficking is substantially higher than shown in the survey, the rate of labor trafficking almost certainly is higher by a factor of three or four times. Labor trafficking is more prevalent even among women and girls by a factor of more the 2:1.

Despite the emphasis that governments and NGOs accord to gangs, recruiters, coyotes, employers and unscrupulous boyfriends as human trafficking perpetrators, trafficking survivors ascribe little blame to these ‘usual suspects’. Instead, survivors overwhelming identify their family and friends as being responsible for their victimization. Fathers take their sons and daughters out of school and into the fields for a few extra pesos a day. Mothers place their daughters as domestics with wealthy families in the city in the desperate hope that both the daughter and the family will have more to eat as a result.

It would be wrong, however, to interpret this data as evidence that fathers and mothers are bad actors who sell their children into slavery for base motives. The reality is that exploiting family members is often the only recourse that poor families have in the struggle for daily survival. Trafficking is typically not volitional; it is an act driven by desperation more than avarice or greed.

Few traffickers are arrested or prosecuted in Guatemala. The numbers have increased sharply in recent years in relative terms, but the absolute numbers are very low. Tens of thousands of people are trafficked each year; tens of people are arrested each year in response. This discrepancy is often interpreted by the international community as evidence that the GoG needs stronger laws and better law enforcement. An alternative interpretation suggested by the survey data is that the small numbers of arrests and prosecutions reflect the limited role that criminal enterprise plays in trafficking relative to the role played by families. If families are the principal perpetrators of human trafficking, are
prosecutors and judges going to arrest, convict, and imprison mothers and fathers for their desperation-driven efforts to survive?

Trafficking victims average five years in servitude. Rescues of any kind are rare; rescues by the authorities are virtually non-existent. Trafficking typically ends when the victim walks or runs away or when the employer voluntarily releases the victim whose labor is no longer needed. Walking away is by far the most common exit which raises questions about the extent of coercion that is actually involved in most trafficking situations. The data do not speak to this directly, but the frequency with which victims walk away suggests that the coercion most victims face is psychological more than physical. This is not to dismiss the importance of psychological coercion. Still, the likelihood is that victims in many situations can walk away at any time but choose not do so. Some of them stay because they fear for their safety or that of their families. Others appear to stay because they are driven by the same economic desperation that drove their families to traffic them in the first place. Many victims appear driven to remain in servitude because they do not think they have any place they can go, including home, where their survival and economic prospects would be any better.

Another point which is not addressed directly in the data is the possibility that trafficking victims may learn from their victimization. They learn that trafficking often is not fatal. Many learn that trafficking victims can escape relatively easily when they perceive it is in their interest to do so. They learn that trafficking can assist the family economically in desperate times. In short they learn that trafficking of family members is a rational, non-fatal, temporary, very nasty but relatively effective last resort for personal and family survival. We cannot test this with the data available, but it is reasonable hypothesis to be tested in future research.

A related hypothesis is that the experience of trafficking may increase rather than diminish the likelihood of victims becoming perpetrators of human trafficking later in their lives. To the extent that survivors think that exploiting family members is a rational response to economic necessity, they may be encouraged to repeat the practice when they head families of their own in crisis. This is consistent with the widespread idea that trafficking is an accepted cultural practice in some communities.

Most trafficking victims appear to be reintegrated relatively seamlessly into their communities after their servitude ends. They typically receive little assistance from the government or their communities and only a little from their families, but neither do they report any substantial discrimination. They are neither celebrated nor stigmatized in their community when they return. In a small but significant number of cases, they are trafficked again. One interpretation of recidivism is that they did not learn from their initial experience. Another quite different interpretation of what they learned from their initial victimization is that trafficking is a rational, non-fatal, temporary, nasty but relatively effective last resort for economic survival is desperate times. In about five percent of cases survivors either fall victim again or chose victimization as the least-bad-alternative available to them.

There is widespread public support in Guatemala for increasing the services provided to trafficking victims. Overwhelming majorities of citizens and survivors support greater health care and psychological
services, job training, protection and legal assistance. Victims who receive assistance express satisfaction with what they receive.

Only small minorities of survivors receive assistance of any sort, however. This is not because medical facilities are turning survivors away or the legal system refuses to protect survivors or prosecute perpetrators. The issue instead is that survivors typically have little if any contact with authorities who might make them aware of available resources. Since most survivors escape captivity on their own rather than being rescued, and since they typically return home to the family that arranged their servitude in the first place, there is no one to take them to the clinic when they return and no desire on the part of survivors or their families to involve police or prosecutors. Even if the government or NGOs substantially increase the services available to trafficking survivors, it is not certain that substantially greater numbers of survivors would take advantage of them.

B. The Four P’s in Perspective

The U.S. Government’s counter-trafficking policy is based on the “Four P’s” protocol emphasizing: Prevention and awareness-raising activities, including interventions intended to address root causes; Protection of survivors by providing direct services and increasing the capacity of first responders; Prosecution of traffickers and the enactment of legislation criminalizing trafficking; and Partnerships, both regionally and between relevant government agencies and NGOs.

1. Protection

The protection of and provision of services to trafficking survivors is a laudable goal and one, which the survey shows, is widely supported by both citizens and survivors in Guatemala. It also is difficult to implement as the previous discussion suggests. This is because of the difficulty of identifying survivors at the point when their captivity ends in order to connect them to the protection and services regime that exists. Given that virtually none of the survivors are rescued by or otherwise have any contact with the authorities when their servitude ends, their knowledge and access to survivor programs is limited. Even where survivors are aware of the services existing to help them, they may not want to access those services if their families were complicit in their having been trafficked for fear that informing the authorities might cause legal problems for their families. Survivors also may not be aware of any needs they might have for medical or psychological assistance. As a result they may not seek out and take advantage of the resources available even if they know of their availability.

Even if parents were not complicit in the trafficking, survivors still may be reluctant to cooperate with police and prosecutors because of fears of retribution by the small numbers of traffickers who are truly bad actors. Survivors may also fear, rightfully or not, that they personally are at risk of prosecution for things they did while being trafficked or for not doing enough to escape from captivity before they did.

Since the government has little or no contact with recent survivors, effective protection and service provision programs cannot rely upon government agencies to identify and enroll survivors. Neither can
protection programs rely on survivors to self-identify and seek out services. Increasing knowledge and awareness programs designed to highlight the services available and assuring that the police will not be informed unless the victim specifically requests their intervention would help. Programs might be designed to target communities where trafficking survivors are concentrated and employ social workers to canvass the community for recent survivors providing knowledge and awareness, assurances of confidentiality, and a personal escort to a non-governmental site where a needs assessment could be conducted and necessary services initiated. Unfortunately, C-TIP experts are not well informed about the nature, extent and distribution of trafficking survivors in Guatemala and lack the knowledge to effectively target and help them.

2. Prosecution:

The Government of Guatemala, with the encouragement of the U.S. Department of State and USAID has made substantial efforts over the last decade to strengthen counter-trafficking laws and provide more effective enforcement by police, prosecutors and judges. Stronger laws and law enforcement make sense to the extent that trafficking is perpetrated by gangs, coyotes, illegal recruiters and others for whom trafficking is a business enterprise driven by cost/benefit calculations. Properly done, stronger laws and law enforcement can drive up the costs relative to the benefits of trafficking and make the enterprise less profitable. 34

One the reasons that prosecution is emphasized as a counter-trafficking strategy is the assumption that trafficking is part of a broader criminal enterprise usually including drug smuggling. Despite the prevalence of this assumption, there is virtually no evidence in the survey data to suggest that drug smuggling is related in any significant way to human trafficking in Guatemala.

It is possible, of course, that U.S. drug enforcement officials are correct that drug gangs also engage in human trafficking. According to the evidence from the survey, however, drug gangs are complicit in such a small percentage of trafficking cases that even if all forms of drug related human trafficking were eliminated, 95% of the trafficking problem would remain.

This is not to argue against supporting a strong prosecution regime. Reducing trafficking by even five percent would benefit hundreds of citizens each year. Moreover, although we do not have evidence on the subject, it is reasonable to believe that criminal enterprise trafficking is among the worst, most coercive, and most dangerous types and the hardest for the victims to escape. Even if this is so, however, the emphasis placed on prosecution, broadly defined, is disproportionate to the role that

34 Ironically, the war on drugs may be counter-productive to C-TIP efforts. To the extent that drug gangs are involved in and earn part of their revenue from both drug smuggling and trafficking, then changing the cost/benefit ratio of drug smuggling by making smuggling more difficult/costly, may increase the incentives for gangs to increase their trafficking activities. Trafficking in this sense is a substitute good for Drug gangs. Decreasing gangs’ incentives to engage in one activity can increase the incentives for the gangs to engage in the other. This is not an observation based on direct evidence. It is not even a prediction. It is merely a possibility consistent with the data and based on logic and reason.
criminal enterprise appears to play in Guatemalan trafficking. The concern is that enhanced prosecution siphons resources from other C-TIP programs and discourages policy makers from designing innovative programs based on more realistic, evidence-based understandings of the true drivers of trafficking. If nothing else, the evidence that the level of trafficking in Guatemala has not declined appreciably in the years since Guatemala enacted Article 202 and launched significant new police and prosecution programs suggests the need for a serious reconsideration of the emphasis accorded to prosecution as a cornerstone of U.S. counter-trafficking policy.

3. Prevention

Prevention programs in Guatemala are predicated on the assumption that increased public knowledge and awareness of trafficking will enable people to make better life choices and reduce their risks of being trafficked. The assumption is that people become ensnared in trafficking because they engage in risky behaviors not knowing the risks involved. The acceptance of this assumption is widespread; even the public accepts this assumption which is reflected in the data showing that a lack of information is the primary reason people give to explain why Guatemalans are trafficked (see Figure 40).

The survey results confirm that some aspects of knowledge and awareness are extremely low in Guatemala. For example, the term, trafficking, is not widely known nor is the law that defines and proscribes it. Even those who have heard of trafficking are not able to clearly define what trafficking is. On the other hand, most Guatemalans do know that sex and labor abuses are widespread, even if they do not use the right words to describe them. They also know the risks of sex and labor exploitation are high. If anything they probably exaggerate the risk of trafficking for most groups of people.

Despite this knowledge, however, there is a steady stream of new trafficking victims every year. While some victims of trafficking are ensnared through ignorance of the risks, many more appear to become victims as the result of choices driven by economic desperation. Many respondents know the risks to themselves and their children of leaving home for work, or sending their children to work in the city or on a farm. They accept those risks, however, or even exploit them as a cruel but rational response to the lack of better survival opportunities in their home communities. Increased knowledge and awareness, may help the economically marginal correctly name the bad things that they experience or that they do to family members. It may also increase the sense of guilt and shame that family members feel for exploiting their sons and daughters for survival. It requires a significant leap of faith, however, to assume that increasing public knowledge and awareness of trafficking will change the behaviors of individuals desperate for survival and lacking better survival opportunities.

Consistent with this interpretation, there is little evidence in the survey at either the individual or aggregate level that those with greater knowledge and awareness of trafficking are any less likely to be trafficked. This is especially so when the effects of education and poverty are controlled. The wealthy, are better educated on the whole, are more knowledgeable about trafficking and less likely to be trafficked that the poor. Among the poor, however, there is no relationship between knowledge/awareness and the incidence of trafficking. Indeed, there is even a slight suggestion in the
data that knowledge and awareness of trafficking among the poor are associated with a slightly higher incidence of trafficking. It is conceivable that enhanced knowledge and awareness may be counter-productive by alerting the poor to the economic opportunities that trafficking may provide. This association is weak and should not be over-interpreted. More certain, however, is that there is very little evidence supporting the critical assumption of USAID policy that increased knowledge and awareness reduce the incidence of trafficking. USAID/Guatemala has been promoting various knowledge and awareness programs for years during which time the level of trafficking in Guatemala has remained unchanged.

4. Partnerships

Promoting partnerships regionally and between relevant government agencies, NGOs and corporations is the most recent of the four “P’s” embraced by the C-TIP community. It reflects the common sense idea that a coordinated attack on trafficking involving public-private partnerships at all levels is the most effective way to proceed.

The current survey with its focus on public opinion has little to say directly about counter-trafficking partnerships which involve connections among C-TIP specialists in Guatemala and not the ordinary citizens interviewed in the survey. The qualitative interviews conducted with members of the C-TIP community at the outset of the study speak more to partnerships. These interviews confirm the existence of a well-connected community of C-TIP specialists in Guatemala with high levels of communication and cooperation involving policy makers, police, prosecutors, and judges, a diverse groups of NGOs, high ranking Guatemalan officials, and U.S. officials from the State Department, USAID, the military and drug enforcement.

The question about C-TIP partnerships in Guatemala is less about their existence and organization than about their focus and effectiveness. Indeed, the qualitative interviews conducted with C-TIP specialists in Guatemala suggests there are widely-shared misperceptions about the nature, extent and drivers of human trafficking in Guatemala even among members of the counter-trafficking community. This is reflected in the human trafficking narrative consistently repeated by C-TIP specialists concerning the sex-trafficking of under-aged women at the hands of criminal gangs and unscrupulous boyfriends. The narrative is fueled by stories based on the experiences of a relatively small number of young women rescued from brothels by law enforcement officials and frequently provided survivor care services by NGOs. C-TIP specialists are quick to concede, when pressed, that there are other forms of trafficking, but the under-aged female, sex-trafficking narrative is consistently front and center in C-TIP discussions.

Under-aged sex-trafficking by criminals is a gruesome narrative and no less horrific for the fact that this form of trafficking appears to be relatively rare. The narrative is not wrong, of course. Significant numbers of young girls are ensnared in sex-trafficking. It is, however, misleading. Other forms of trafficking are much more common even for young women. More common forms of trafficking, however, are consistently neglected by C-TIP community because of the focus on the criminal sex-trafficking of young girls.
The problem with the sex-trafficking narrative is that it can lead to misplaced priorities and policies. If trafficking is about young women being lured by boyfriends and forced by criminals to work in sex-clubs, then it makes sense to combat the problem, as current policy does, by prosecuting the perpetrators and educating young women about the risks of dropping out of school and leaving home with a boyfriend. But if trafficking is a family enterprise where children are exploited by parents out of economic desperation, then prosecution is not likely to be effective; protection and service provision to survivors will be more difficult; and prevention is likely to require a lot more than educating people to the risks which they already know all too well.

Human Trafficking in Guatemala is mostly an economic problem, but it is treated as a criminal and education problem. Arresting and prosecuting gang members and the owners of brothels who employ young girls and educating girls about the risks of sex-trafficking are laudable policies. Both deserve to be important parts of a comprehensive counter-trafficking regime. They are, however, only a small part of what an effective C-TIP regime needs to be.

A comprehensive C-TIP regime must also address the economic desperation that is the root cause for the largest parts of human trafficking. Most people who are trafficked are not coerced at gun-point. Many are not even deceived. They know their choices are risky; many appear even to enter into servitude semi-voluntarily as the least-bad of the few economic options open to them. Having the government confirm through education programs that their option is a bad one is unlikely to change their behavior since the option of doing nothing and staying at home with their family in abject poverty is to surrender to hopelessness.

The solution to human trafficking in Guatemala is easy to describe and hard to bring about. It involves increasing economic opportunities especially for younger generations. The policies that are needed are those the encourage families to keep their children in school both by extending and enforcing compulsory education but also by providing impoverished families with cash incentives to keep their children in school in order to replace at least part of the economic benefits that trafficking children otherwise might provide. Minimum wage laws for domestic help, farm workers and other low wage positions need to strengthened and rigorously enforced even in the face of the resistance of middle and upper income citizens who in many cases are unwitting perpetrators of human trafficking blind to the damage their profit driven policies do to the poor. People who do not think of themselves as traffickers are likely an even bigger part of the problem than those who do.

C-TIP education programs need to target the middle and upper-classes, not because they are likely victims but because they are unconscious perpetrators. Even when they do not employ housekeepers for slave wages, their acquiescence in traditional practices contributes to the perpetuation of many common forms of trafficking.

Job training programs head the list of services that should be provided to trafficking survivors. Medical, psychological and legal help are fine too, but do nothing to break the cycle of trafficking. Much more
needs to be done to identify survivors of labor as well as sex-trafficking and to help them acquire the skills that will expand their economic options.

The most important policy of all, and the hardest to achieve, is the promotion of real, meaningful economic reforms contributing both to economic growth and to the more equitable sharing of that growth with the lowest sectors of society. Growth alone is not sufficient. The lower segments of society need to have the education and skills necessary to participate in a modern economy. But increasing education and job skills without real economic growth will be of little use unless there are jobs available for those with appropriate skills.

Unfortunately, the likelihood is that human trafficking in Guatemala will continue to be approached more as a law enforcement and education problem than as an economic one. It is far easier and cheaper to train police and prosecutors and distribute text-messages about trafficking dangers to young girls than to address long standing social and economic structural concerns.

C. Improving C-TIP Surveys

Methodologically, the Guatemala C-TIP survey was intended to assess the prospects for using survey research methods to generate actionable data on human trafficking and on rare and hidden sub-populations more generally. With regard to trafficking the results are promising.

The survey succeeded in identifying a large and diverse group of former victims. This was in spite of the implementer’s failure to use the “adaptive sampling” methods initially planned. Indeed, the alternative method used to oversample survivors -- using trafficking experts to identify trafficking hotspots and at risk groups—was largely a failure. The hotspots identified and the communities deemed to be most at risk of trafficking by experts were substantially wrong. The only reason that a large sample of trafficking survivors was achieved was because the scope of the trafficking problem in Guatemala is so large. The over-sampling strategy did not identify any more survivors than would have resulted from a simple national probability sample of the same size.

Contrary to initial fears regarding the willingness of former victims to discuss their experiences, survivors were remarkably willing to self-identify and to talk in detail about their experiences. List Experiments also were useful for corroborating the number of trafficking victims identified in the sample, although it appears that even list experiments may be limited in terms of allowing individuals to report the most difficult and embarrassing forms of behavior. For example, the List Experiments appear to under-report forced prostitution.

Identifying victims based on their work histories proved more difficult. In part this was because the survey focused on individuals’ current employment or their recent (past three years) history working away from home. This decision to focus on current and recent employment was based on a desire to probe the fresh memories of victims undiminished by time and intervening events. In fact, many fewer people leave home for work than local experts indicated during the pre-survey scoping trip.
because of the large number of housewives, students, retired workers, and unemployed workers in Guatemala, a very small percentage of the total population is employed in the formal economy at any moment. Thus the percentage of people who were asked about their employment experiences was very small.

A clear lesson of the survey is the need to explore experiences in the informal as well as the formal economy and to explore the entire work history of respondents, not just their most recent work experiences. Memories of older trafficking experiences will need to be discounted appropriately and the frailty of memory acknowledged, but a broader understanding of employment abuses requires a broader more comprehensive approach.

Given the very strong connection between working away from home and trafficking victimization, much broader and stronger batteries of questions are needed to identify those who work abroad and the much larger number of survivors who worked away from home within Guatemala. Indeed, given the small percentages of people who work away from home in any capacity, it may be necessary to oversample this group as well.

Finally, the survey instrument could benefit from a variety of revisions. Labor trafficking needs to be disaggregated and different types of labor trafficking analyzed separately. Given the evidence that many victims appear capable of escaping servitude at will, it would be useful to probe deeper into why victims remain as long as they do and why they choose to leave when they do? The relationship of victims to their family merits more study in light of the role that family plays as perpetrators. It would be interesting to know which family members are most likely to be trafficked and why. It would be interesting to know more about the parents of trafficking victims and the nature of their roles in the process. At the same time, a number of current questions produced little interesting information and can probably be dropped from a revised instrument to create more space for new content.

The current survey has obviously limits. It is focused on a single country in a single year. The number of trafficking survivors while very large compared to previous studies is still small in absolute terms. While it is clear that labor trafficking is far more common than sex trafficking, there is still a question as to whether the survey fully captures the extent of sex-trafficking in all of its forms. And although all of the conclusions are at least consistent with the evidence produced, the strength of the evidence varies considerably. Some of the more interesting and provocative conclusions are based largely on circumstantial evidence. Nevertheless, the study has generated a wealth of data much of it previously unavailable on human trafficking in Guatemala or anywhere else. The study confirms important aspects of the conventional wisdom about trafficking but contradicts and corrects other aspects of this wisdom. And, perhaps most importantly, the study provides a foundation, flawed though it may be in some respects, on which future studies can build.
References:


APPENDIX A:

GUATEMALA C-TIP ASSESSMENT SAMPLE DESIGN

The USAID Guatemala Counter-Trafficking in Persons (C-TIP) Assessment was designed to assess current knowledge, attitudes and practices with regard to trafficking threats and to identify trafficking victims in sufficient numbers to explore in depth their backgrounds, circumstances and experiences. The sample design for the USAID Guatemala C-TIP Assessment was created to address two principal objectives:

1. Create a national probability sample of individuals between the ages of 15 and 45 in Guatemala (Phase I).
2. Create an oversample of individuals in areas believed to have high trafficking incidence, with a particular focus on the indigenous population and areas of low socio-economic background (Phase 2).

Sample weights were used to correct for imperfections in the sample that might lead to bias. In particular, adjustments were made for non-response and to adjust the weighted sample distribution for age, sex, and urbanity, according to national census data. Expansion factors were calculated considering the Phase 2 sample as a subsample of the Phase 1 national probability sample.

1. Design of the Phase 2 Sample

USAID provided the following guidelines for the design of the Phase 2 sample to consist of men and women ages 15-45:

- Lower socio-economic status (SES) zones within Guatemala City (approximately 1500 interviews).
- Lower SES areas (Urban and Rural) of the provinces of Huehuetenango, San Marcos, & Quetzaltenango (approximately 1000 interviews).
- Agricultural areas along the southern coast of Guatemala (both Ladino and Indigenous Communities) (approximately 750 interviews).
- Cobán town and surrounding rural areas (500 interviews).
- Males in the mining areas around Lake Izabal and Salamá (250 interviews).

Details of the Sample:

- Probabilistic – because the probability of inclusion is known and different than zero for each member of the population; this will allow estimating the precision of the sample results.
- Three phase sample – with primary sample units equivalent to cartographic sectors, secondary sample units equivalent to five occupied houses within each primary sample unit and, as a third stage, the selection of people between the ages of 15 and 65 years per household.
• Stratified – because the sample units are classified in accordance to the socio-economic characteristics.

Census sector lists for each of the domains were utilized for the sampling frame.

A fixed sample size of 4,000 was established by USAID and Social Impact for Phase 2. Using the socio-economic criteria noted above and PPS sampling, the following sample was drawn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Censal Areas</th>
<th>Interviews per area</th>
<th>Total # interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad de Guatemala</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huehutenango, San Marcos &amp; Quetzaltenango</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobán y áreas rurales adyacentes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áreas de minería cerca del lago de Izabal y el Departamento de Izabal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petén – Frontera con Belice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jutiapa – frontera con El Salvador</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áreas agrícolas del sur del país</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corredor central: Totonicapán, Sololá, El Quiché, Chimaltenango y Sacatepéquez</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2 Sample Selection**

Censal areas were selected in the first stage of sampling based on probability proportion to size (PPS) according to the number of primary sampling units in each domain of the study. In the second stage, households were selected in each censal area with equal probability of selection assigned to each household. The third stage of sampling—respondent-level sampling—involved selection of individuals age 15 to 45 from each household, using the “next birthday” method.

**Final Phase 2 Sample**

The sample design for Phase 2 includes the following eight independent and mutually exclusive domains:
2. Calculation of the Expansion Factors

Data from the eight Phase 2 domains were integrated with the Phase 1 national probability sample representing all 22 departamentos in Guatemala. The two databases were integrated based on area and socio-economic strata. Another important aspect to keep in mind for merging both phases was to consider both measurement periods as one for the sake of analysis.

Sample sectors by urban/rural and socio-economic stratum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Socio-economic stratum</th>
<th>Sectors in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Calculation of the Expansion Factors

Data from the eight Phase 2 domains were integrated with the Phase 1 national probability sample representing all 22 departamentos in Guatemala. The two databases were integrated based on area and socio-economic strata. Another important aspect to keep in mind for merging both phases was to consider both measurement periods as one for the sake of analysis.

Sample sectors by urban/rural and socio-economic stratum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Socio-economic stratum</th>
<th>Sectors in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample frame for a national domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Socio-economic stratum</th>
<th>Sectors in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expansion factors for men and women ages 15-45 were calculated in the following manner:

The probability to select one person age 15-45, in the j-th house, in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata will be calculated using the following formula:

\[ P(V_{hij}) = \frac{K_h m_{hi} n_{hi}}{m_h m_{hi} Q_{hij}} \]

\( K_h \) = Number of PSU selected in the h-th strata for the national interview for human trafficking.

\( n_{hi} \) = Number of secondary units of the sample in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.

\( m_{hi} \) = Number of houses in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata, according to the 2002 people and household census.

\( m_h \) = Number of households in the h-th strata, according to the 2002 people and household census.

\( m_{hi}^* \) = Number of households in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata, based on the updated list of households in the PSU collected during fieldwork.

\( Q_{hij} \) = Number of persons between the ages of 15 to 65 in the j-th household, in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.

---
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The expansion factor is given by:

\[ F_{hij} = \frac{m_h m_{hi} q_{hi}}{n_{hi} k_h m_{hi}} \]

**Expansion Factor Adjustments**

**Adjustment for Non-Response**

The adjustment for non-response was both calculated for households and persons at the PSU level using the following expressions:

**a) Household non-response**

\[ F_{hij}^* = F_{hij} \frac{V_{si}}{V_{cri}} \]

Where:

- \( F_{hij}^* \) = Corrected expansion factor for non-response in the k-th household, the i-th PSU of the h-th strata.
- \( V_{si} \) = Number of selected inhabited households in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.
- \( V_{cri} \) = Number of inhabited households with response in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.

**b) Person-level non-response**

\[ W_{hij} = F_{hij}^* \frac{q_{hi}}{q_{hi}^*} \]

Where:

- \( W_{hij} \) = Corrected expansion factor for non-response at person level, in the j-th household, of the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.
- \( q_{hi} \) = Number of people between the ages of 15 to 65 selected in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.
- \( q_{hi}^* \) = Number of people between the ages of 15 and 65 selected with positive response in the i-th PSU, in the h-th strata.
Adjustment for Projection

The adjusted expansion factors due to non-response were corrected to ensure that in the domain of interest of the survey, the total of the population could be obtained. This was obtained by INE’s population projection at the study mid-point, using the following expression:

\[ F_D = W_{hij} \frac{\text{Proye}_D}{\text{Pest}_D} \]

Where:

- \( F_D \) = Corrected expansion factor for the projection of Domain D.
- \( \text{Proye}_D \) = Population between the ages of 15 to 65 year according to the projection for the domain according to urban a rural area.
- \( \text{Pest}_D \) = Population between the ages of 15 through 65 years of age estimated in the interview.

---
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[All comments to survey administrator or notes for the researcher are in bold or bracketed.]

[All instructions to be read are in bold italics.]

[Sections are labeled between “~” for reference purposes only, and should not be put on the screen.]

[Do not put question numbers on the screen. Question numbers are for researcher reference.]

[As indicated in the codebook, there is a “don’t know,” “does not apply,” and “refused to answer” option. Do not offer respondents these options, however. If a respondent refuses to answer, note “It would be a big help to us if you would be willing to answer this question, but if you would prefer not to, we can go ahead to the next questions. Thank you.”]

[For each experiment, include in the dataset a variable for which condition the respondent received (e.g., A, B, C, etc.).]

[Unless otherwise indicated, please fill in one response per question.]

[Unless otherwise indicated, please read out loud all answer options.]
I. Survey Identifier Information

Q 1 [Enumerator] Enumerator Name and ID:

FIRST NAME ________________ LAST NAME ________________ ENUMERATOR ID ________________

Q 2 [Survey Number]

UNIQUE SURVEY IDENTIFIER
[RANDOMLY GENERATED]

Q 3 [Location]:

DEPARTMENT ________________ MUNICIPALITY ________________ CITY / TOWN ________________

DEPARTMENT CODE (22)] [MUNICIPALITY CODE (334)]

Q 4 [Urban] Is the respondent in a rural or urban area? [Use the country’s definition]
1. Urban
2. Rural

Q 5 [Population] How large is the respondent’s current city/village?
1. National capital (metropolitan area) - Guatemala City
2. Large city - 100,000+
3. Medium city - 50,000 – 99,999
4. Small city - 10,000 – 49,999
5. Town – 5,000 – 10,000
6. Rural – less than 5,000

Q 6 [Time Stamp] Date/Time of Interview:

A. (DD/MM/YY) ____________

B. Interview Start Time (24 hr. clock) ____________ : ____________

C. Interview End Time (24 hr. clock) ____________ : ____________
II. Module A: Demographics (Household-Level Questions)

First, we would like to ask you some questions about your family structure and household.

Q 7 [Household Size I] How many people, including yourself, live (e.g., eat and sleep) in your home the majority of the week, at least 4 days of the week? _____

Q 8 [Household Size II] How many people, including yourself, are in your immediate family? (Your immediate family includes you, your spouse, and children only (even if they are not living with you)) _____

Q 9 [Household Size II] How many sons do you have? _____

Q 10 [Household Size II] How many daughters do you have? _____

HOUSEHOLD ROSTER: I want you to think about your household. Your household includes your spouse and children, regardless of if they are alive or deceased. Your household also includes everyone else who normally lives together in this household, including domestic workers that live with you. Please also include family members that would be living in the same home, but are not currently living with you because they had to move away for work. First, list yourself. Then list every other member of your household. For each person, I will ask a series of questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Interviewee:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer only for those who are deceased.

What is [...]’s cause of death?
1. Sickness
2. Work Accident
3. Other Accident
4. Killed (Not related to internal conflict)
5. Killed (Caused by internal conflict)
6. Other (Specify)

Skip the rest of the roster questions in this module and the other household roster module for those who are deceased (Go to Q 25).
|----|-------------|------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
|    | Please provide the first names of all of the people who are part of this household, whether they are family or not, starting with yourself?  
|    | - Probes: 1 Is there anyone else?  
|    | - If No, 2. Are there any members of the household who are not members of the family who you have not mentioned?  
|    | - If No, 3. Are there any employees who live in the household?  
|    | What is the relationship of […] to the head of household?  
|    | 1 Head of Household  
|    | 2 Spouse  
|    | 3 Son/Daughter/Step-Child/Half-Child  
|    | 4 Son/Daughter-in-law  
|    | 5 Father/Mother  
|    | 6 Sister/Brother  
|    | 7 Another Relative (Specify)  
|    | 8 Employee  
|    | 9 Friend  
|    | 10 Unrelated person  
|    | What is […]’s gender?  
|    | 0 Male  
|    | 1 Female  
|    | How old was […] on their last birthday?  
|    | What is […]’s marital status?  
|    | 1 Single  
|    | 2 Married  
|    | 3 Common Law Marriage  
|    | 4 Divorced  
|    | 5 Separated  
|    | 6 Widowed  
|    | What is […]’s ethnic group?  
|    | 1 Achi  
|    | 2 Aketeko  
|    | 3 Awakateco  
|    | 4 Ch’orti’  
|    | 5 Chuj  
|    | 6 Itza  
|    | 7 Ik’il  
|    | 8 Jakalteco  
|    | 9 Kaqchikel  
|    | 10 K’iche’  
|    | 11 Mam  
|    | 12 Mopam  
|    | 13 Poqomam  
|    | 14 Q’anjob’al  
|    | 15 Q’eqchi  
|    | 16 Sakapulteco  
|    | 17 Sipakapense  
|    | 18 Tekiteko  
|    | 19 Tz’utujil  
|    | 20 Upanteco  
|    | 21 Xinca  
|    | 22 Garifuna  
|    | 23 Ladino or  
|    | 24 None  
|    | 25 Other  
|    | Does […] currently live at this residence?  
|    | 1 Yes  
|    | 2 No and not sure  
|    | 3 Deceased  
|    | 4 No and alive  
|    | If “Deceased”, go to Q 19.  
|    | Otherwise, go to Q 20.  
| 12 | Mopam  
| 20 | Tz’utujil  
| 21 | Upanteco  
| 22 | Garifuna  
| 23 | Ladino or  
| 24 | None  
| 25 | Other  

Answer only for those who are deceased.  
What is […]’s cause of death?  
1 Sickness  
2 Work Accident  
3 Other Accident  
4 Killed (Not related to internal conflict)  
5 Killed (Caused by internal conflict)  
6 Other (Specify)  
Skip the rest of the roster questions in this module and the other household roster module for those who are deceased (Go to Q 25)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
<td>1234567891011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Module B: Knowledge / Awareness of Trafficking (Individual-Level Questions)

Okay, let me turn now and ask you some questions about your knowledge about trafficking in Guatemala.

Q 25 [heard_ht] We have heard some discussion recently about what some people refer to as Human Trafficking [Trata?]. Have you heard anything about this?
0  No
1  Yes

If yes to Q 25, then go to Q 26. Otherwise, skip to Q 28.

Q 26 [define_ht] How would you define trata? (What does trata mean to you?) ___________ [Open-Ended]

Q 27 [follow_ht] How closely would you say you have followed the discussion about human trafficking in Guatemala?
1  Extremely closely
2  Very closely
3  Moderately closely
4  Slightly closely
5  Not closely at all

Q 28 [exp_defnht] [EXPERIMENT -- RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENTS TO A/B/C]

A. As you may know, some persons who pay an individual/agent to be transported from one country to another end up being deceived and forced to take work in the sex industry when they reach their destination.

B. As you may know, some persons who pay an individual/agent to be transported from one country to another end up being deceived and forced to work in exploitative environments when they reach their destination.

C. As you may know, some persons who pay an individual/agent to be transported from one country to another end up being deceived and forced to take work in menial labor when they reach their destination.

Q 29. How would you best describe such individuals?
1  Illegal immigrants
2  Legal migrants
3  Victims of traffickers
4  Other (Please Specify)

Q 30 [categ_ht] There are different ideas about what Human Trafficking is and is not. For each of the following situations please tell us whether you consider it to be an example of Human Trafficking or Not Human Trafficking). [Randomize order of List]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, not human trafficking</th>
<th>Yes, human trafficking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A woman is recruited to work in a nursing job but upon arrival is forced to do house work.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A child is forced to work in the fields with his parents rather than go to school.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A man hires a coyote to take him to the US for work but is kidnapped by a gang in Mexico and forced to join them.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A 14 year old girl is lured by her boyfriend into working as a prostitute for his financial benefit</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A 22 year old girl is lured by her boyfriend into working as a prostitute for his financial benefit</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. A person is recruited to work in the fields but there is little work and the cost of room and board means he is in debt to the employer and is forbidden from leaving without paying.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Parents are paid by a woman who takes their baby to the city to beg for money, returning the baby to the parents afterwards.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A person is paid by gangs to smuggle drugs across the border and is caught and imprisoned by the police.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. An immigrant to Guatemala from another country is recruited for a job in a maquiladora but on arrival is locked up and has to work 12-18 hours a day with little to no pay.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A person goes abroad voluntarily and works illegally at a factory for long hours and low wages.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. A person is offered an agricultural job outside of Guatemala but is told on arrival that there is no job and they must return home.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. A child is kidnapped from her parents, and adopted by a family in the US that did not know that she was kidnapped and sold.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A pregnant woman stays in a “maternity home,” that offer to pay her delivery expenses in exchange for light housekeeping. Afterwards the home presents her with an impossible bill, which they would waive if she signs away her baby.</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 31 [202_ht1] Are you aware of Article 202, Guatemala’s trafficking law that began in 2009?
0  No
1  Yes

If yes to Q 31, then go to Q 32. Otherwise, skip to Q 33.
Q 32 [202_h2] If Yes, which ones of the following activities are illegal under that law? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

- 0 Forcible prostitution
- 1 Forced labor or services
- 2 Forcible begging
- 3 Irregular adoptions
- 4 Forcible marriage
- 5 Underage marriage

Now I’m going to give you the definition of Trata and would like to ask you some questions on what you think about this issue.

[EXPERIMENT -- RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENTS TO A/B/C/D]

A. Trafficking (Trata) is when someone is recruited, transported, or held through threats or use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, or the abuse of power for the purposes of exploitation. Trafficked individuals are treated as possessions and made to do work that they do not want to do through physical force or threats of force against the person or their family. Trafficked individuals are often told lies about the type of work they will do or the amount of money and benefits they will receive. The Trata can happen at home, anywhere in Guatemala or in another country. This is what we call TRATA. [Read definition but give card that respondent can keep with the definition on one side and help resources listed on the other.]

B. Trafficking (Trata) is when someone is recruited, transported, or held through threats or use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, or the abuse of power for the purposes of exploitation, which include forced prostitution and sexual exploitation. Trafficked individuals are treated as possessions and made to do work that they do not want to do through physical force or threats of force against the person or their family. Trafficked individuals are often told lies about the type of work they will do or the amount of money and benefits they will receive. The Trata can happen at home, anywhere in Guatemala or in another country. This is what we call TRATA. [Read definition but give card that respondent can keep with the definition on one side and help resources listed on the other.]

C. Trafficking (Trata) is when someone is recruited, transported, or held through threats or use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, or the abuse of power for the purposes of exploitation, which include forced labor. Trafficked individuals are treated as possessions and made to do work that they do not want to do through physical force or threats of force against the person or their family. Trafficked individuals are often told lies about the type of work they will do or the amount of money and benefits they will receive. The Trata can happen at home, anywhere in Guatemala or in another country. This is what we call TRATA. [Read definition but give card that respondent can keep with the definition on one side and help resources listed on the other.]

D. [No prime to read, go straight to next question Q 33]

Q 33 [humtraf_prob] How big of a problem is human trafficking in the Guatemala?

- 0 A big problem
- 1 Moderate problem
- 2 Slight problem
- 3 Not a problem at all

Q 34 [US_humtraf] How is Guatemala affected by the trafficking of humans? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

- 0 Guatemala is a country of origin - people are trafficked from Guatemala to worked in other countries such as Mexico and the United States
- 1 Guatemala is a destination country - people from other countries are trafficked to Guatemala
- 2 Guatemala is a transit country - people are trafficked from other countries, north through Guatemala to Mexico and the United States
- 3 Guatemala has internal human trafficking - people from Guatemala are trafficked internally within Guatemala

Q 35 [media_h] Where have you gotten most of your information about human trafficking in Guatemala? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

- 1 TV
- 2 Radio
- 3 Friends and Relatives
- 4 Community leaders
- 5 Newspapers/magazines
- 6 Leaflets/publications on the issue
- 7 Internet
- 8 Personal experience
- 9 Other (Please Specify):
Q 36 [reason_ht] What do you think is the principal reason people become victims of sex trafficking?

1. Lack of Information / lack of education
2. Poor wages
3. Unemployment
4. Reckless behavior by the victims
5. Weak laws/law enforcement
6. Gender discrimination
7. Drug gangs
8. Ethnic discrimination
9. Family pressure to earn money
10. Other (Please Specify):

Q 37 [reason_ht2] What do you think is the principal reason people become victims of trafficking for forced labor?

1. Lack of Information / lack of education
2. Poor wages
3. Unemployment
4. Reckless behavior by the victims
5. Weak laws/law enforcement
6. Gender discrimination
7. Drug gangs
8. Ethnic discrimination
9. Family pressure to earn money
10. Other (Please Specify):

Q 40 [victim_ht] How much do you think each of the following people are at risk of becoming victims of trafficking in Guatemala? On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 means there no risk that a person will be a victim of trafficking and 10 means there is an extreme risk that a person will be trafficked, what do you think the risk of trafficking is for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Adult Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adolescent Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Adult Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Adolescent Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Illegal immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Indigenous group members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 41 [victim_race I] [EXPERIMENT – Randomize between Card A and Card B – this is intended to see how racism against indigenous groups may affect victim support – the variation is done through the name]

Experiment A Counter-Trafficking Organization in Guatemala is working on providing services to protect and provide relief to human trafficking victims. This poster [Share Card A or Card B (random assignment)] is being used to raise awareness about human trafficking in Guatemala, and depicts an image of someone who has been trafficked, where her trafficker tattooed a price barcode with the word “slave” on her back. I am going to ask you some questions about supporting people in this situation, and I would like you to tell me what you think. Would you favor or oppose the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly favor</th>
<th>Weakly favor</th>
<th>Neither favor nor oppose</th>
<th>Weakly oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A plan to provide victims of trafficking with access to medical care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A plan to provide victims of trafficking with access to legal services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A plan to provide victims of trafficking with access to shelters and reintegration services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A plan to protect victims while prosecuting the trafficker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 42 [concern] How concerned are you personally about human trafficking in Guatemala compared to other problems the country confronts?
0. A great deal of concern
1. A lot of concern
2. A moderate amount of concern
3. A little concern
4. No concern at all

Q 43 [criminalize_traffic] How urgent do you think it is to catch and punish human traffickers?
0. Extremely urgent
1. Very urgent
2. Moderately urgent
3. Slightly urgent
4. Not urgent at all

Q 44 [legis_traffic] How urgent do you think it is for government to inform and warn potential victims about human trafficking?
0. Extremely urgent
1. Very urgent
2. Moderately urgent
3. Slightly urgent
4. Not urgent at all

Q 45 [polity_ht] How effective do you think each of the following measures be in reducing human trafficking? For each of the following, please tell me if you think it would be extremely effective, somewhat effective, or not effective at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Moderately effective</th>
<th>Slightly effective</th>
<th>Not effective at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Adopt stricter laws and stronger penalties for traffickers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Improve economic conditions and wages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Provide young people more information about trafficking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Combat drug gangs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Tighten the borders so people cannot freely enter or leave Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Prosecute those who solicit prostitutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Increase education programs to keep people in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. [manipulation_check I] When you hear the name “Ixmucane,” on a 10-point scale where 0 means non-indigenous and 10 means indigenous, to what extent do you think the woman is a non-indigenous Guatemalan or indigenous Guatemalan? So if you think that Ixmucane could equally be the name of an indigenous woman or a non-indigenous woman, you would select 5. If you think Ixmucane is a name unique to indigenous women, you would pick 10. If you think Ixmucane is a name unique to non-indigenous women, you would pick 0.
GUATEMALA C-TIP SURVEY

Final

I. [manipulation_check II] When you hear the name “Silvia,” on the same 10-point scale where 0 means non-indigenous and 10 means indigenous, to what extent do you think the woman is a non-indigenous Guatemalan or indigenous Guatemalan? So if you think that Silvia could equally be the name of an indigenous woman or a non-indigenous woman, you would select 5. If you think Silvia is a name unique to indigenous women, you would pick 10. If you think Silvia is a name unique to non-indigenous women, you would pick 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-indigenous</th>
<th>Can be either</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 46 [allies_ht] If you or someone close to you were a victim of trafficking, which of the following individuals could be trusted for help? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
1. A police officer
2. A judge or lawyer
3. Procuraduría General de la Nación
4. A soldier
5. An Office of Human Rights Ombudsman
6. A municipal institution representative (e.g., Municipal Women’s Offices)
7. An NGO or other social organization such as the Red Cross
8. A church leader (minister or priest)
9. A family member
10. A teacher
11. A medical professional (doctor or nurse)
12. None of the above

Q 47 [explicit_ht] “Trafficking (Trata) is when someone is recruited, transported, or held through the threat or use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, or the abuse of power for the purposes of exploitation. Exploitation includes the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery. Trafficked individuals are treated as possessions and made to do work that they do not want to do through physical force or threats of force against the person or their family. Trafficked individuals are often told lies about the type of work they will do or the amount of money and benefits they will receive. The Trata can happen at home, anywhere in Guatemala or in another country. With this definition in mind, do you think that that you have ever have been a victim of trata at any time in your own life?

0. No
1. Yes

2. Q 47.a [know_victim] ¿Do you know anyone who has ever been a victim of trata at any time in their life?
0. No
1. Yes

If answered «Yes» to Q47a, continue to Q47b. Otherwise, skip to Q48.

Q 47.b [victim_relation] ¿What relationship do you have with this person or persons?
1. Family member or relative
2. Friend
3. Neighbor
4. Work colleague
5. Other (specify)

Q 47.c [victim_resides] ¿Does this person or persons live in your community?
0. No
1. Yes
Module C: Violence & Tolerance (Individual-Level Questions)

Now we would like to ask you a few questions around your experience with crime and corruption in your community.

Q 48 [Crime I] How safe do you feel from robbery, kidnapping, and assault and other crimes in the neighborhood where you live? Do you feel:
1. Very safe
2. Somewhat safe
3. Somewhat unsafe
4. Very unsafe

Q 49 [Crime II] Have you been a victim of any type of crime in the past 12 months? That is, have you been a victim of robbery, burglary, assault, fraud, blackmail, extortion, violent threats or any other type of crime in the past 12 months?
0. No
1. Yes

Q 50 [Crime IV] Thinking of the most recent occasion on that you were a victim, which of the following type of crime was it?
1. Unarmed robbery
2. Armed robbery
3. Assault but not robbery
4. Sexual violence
5. Kidnapping
6. Burglary (thieves robbed your home or car while no one was there)
7. Extortion (you were threatened with arrest or violence unless you pay someone money)
8. Other (Please Specify):
9. Has never been a victim of a crime

Q 53 [Crime IX] I realize this may be a difficult question. In the last 12 months, how often has anyone hit, slapped or physically hurt you?
1. Never
2. Once
3. Several Times
4. A lot

If 2, 3, of 4 in Q 53, then go to Q 54. Otherwise, skip to Q 55.

Q 54 [Crime IX] The last time you were hit of physically hurt, who hurt you?
1. Mother
2. Father
3. Sister/Brother
4. Son/Daughter
5. Son-in-law/Daughter-in-law
6. Spouse/Partner
7. Other family
8. Boyfriend/Girlfriend
9. Neighbor
10. Employer/Supervisor
11. Co-worker
12. Police/Soldier
13. Stranger
Q 55 [V-Employee] I am going to read you a series of situations that you could see at any time. I would like for you to indicate for each situation if you would approve, disapprove but understand, or disapprove and not understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Not approve but understand what employer did</th>
<th>Not approve nor understand what employer did</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Suppose that an employer hits his/her domestic employee because s/he does not complete his/her work to his/her satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 56 [V-Child]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Not approve but understand what the parent did</th>
<th>Not approve nor understand what the parent did</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Suppose that in order to teach a child, a parent hits the child each time he/she disobeys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 57 [V-Spouse]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Not approve but understand what the husband did</th>
<th>Not approve nor understand what the husband did</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Suppose that a man hits his wife because she does not complete her household work to his satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 58 [V-Other]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Not approve but understand what the parent did</th>
<th>Not approve nor understand what the parent did</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Suppose the a father kills a smuggler who has deceived his son and sold him into forced labor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Suppose a parent accepts money for letting a wealthy family adopt one of their children which they are too poor to support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 62 [Crime VII] We are interested in whether you have ever been treated unfairly. Have you ever been...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Unfairly denied a job or fired?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Unfairly treated by the police?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Unfairly treated in government offices (e.g., courts, agencies, municipal government)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Treated unfairly or badly at restaurants or stores?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes to any in Q 62, go to Q 63. Otherwise, skip to Q 64.

Q 63 [Discrimination II] What do you think are the main reasons that you were treated unfairly? Was it because of... [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]:

1. Your age
2. Your skin color
3. The language your speak
4. Your sex
5. Your race / ethnicity
6. The type of clothes you wear
7. Your occupation
8. Your sexual orientation
9. A physical disability
Q 64 [List Experiment I] [EXPERIMENT – Randomize between Conditions A, B, C, D]
I am now going to read you a list of 3/4 statements. As I read you these statements, please keep count in your head of HOW MANY of them are true for you. I don’t want to know which ones; just HOW MANY apply to you. Please wait until I’ve read all of the statements before telling me HOW MANY of them are true for you.

Condition A: Read 1, 2, 3 (randomize order of statements)
Condition B: Read 1, 2, 3, 4 (randomize order of statements)
Condition C: Read 1, 2, 3, 5 (randomize order of statements)
Condition D: Read 1, 2, 3, 6 (randomize order of statements)
1  You have been asked for money by a friend or family member
2  You have been unable to pay your bills
3  You have been asked to pay a bribe before
4  You have been threatened by your employer if I quit my job
5  You have been forced to work without pay
6  You have been forced to have sex as part of your job

Q 65 [List Experiment II] [EXPERIMENT – Randomize between Conditions A, B, C, D or E, where individuals do not receive the same conditions as in List Experiment I, so those assigned to A get B, C, D or E; those assigned to B get A, C, or D, etc.]
I am now going to read you a list of 3/4 statements. As I read you these statements, please keep count in your head of HOW MANY of them are true for you. I don’t want to know which ones; just HOW MANY apply to you. Please wait until I’ve read all of the statements before telling me HOW MANY of them are true for you.

Condition A: Read 1, 2, 3 (randomize order of statements)
Condition B: Read 1, 2, 3, 4 (randomize order of statements)
Condition C: Read 1, 2, 3, 5 (randomize order of statements)
Condition D: Read 1, 2, 3, 6 (randomize order of statements)
1  You make more money than you need
2  You have traveled outside of Guatemala
3  You have ignored laws you did not like
4  You have been threatened by your employer if you quit your job
5  You have been forced to work without pay
6  You have been forced to have sex as part of your job
V. Module D: Current Work and Child Labor (Individual-Level Questions)

In this next section, we will be asking you about your work experiences.

Q 66 [Work Status] What is your employment status?
1 Full-Time Work for Pay
2 Part-Time Work (30 hours or less) for Pay
3 Self-Employed
4 Student
5 Homemaker
6 Retired
7 Unemployed
8 Disability / Incapacitated

If the respondent is a student, homemaker, retired, unemployed or disabled (Q 66), skip to Q 84. Otherwise, proceed to the next question.


Q 68 [Job Year] How many years have you held your current job?
Number of Years: _______

Q 69 [Job Satisfaction] How satisfied are you with your current job?
1 Very satisfied
2 Somewhat satisfied
3 Somewhat unsatisfied
4 Very unsatisfied

If the respondent is self-employed (Q 66), skip to Q 84. Otherwise, proceed to the next question.

Q 70 [Job Pay] What compensation benefits do you receive in your current job? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
1 No benefits [If this is checked, no other responses should be checked]
2 Regular pay
3 Regular days off
4 Medical expenses
5 Paid sick leave
6 Meals
7 Housing
8 Paid vacation
9 Work clothing
10 Transportation
11 Aguinaldo
12 Bono 14
13 Other (Please Specify): _______

Q 71 [Job Attitude] Which of the following describes your attitudes about your current job? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
1 You are underpaid for the work that you do
2 You work only part-time, but want to work full-time
3 Your job is inferior to your education and skill level
4 Your job does not provide opportunities for promotion/advancement
5 You would change jobs if you could find a better one
6 You are paid less than others doing the same job
7 You are mostly satisfied with your job

Q 72 [Job Contract] Do you have a written contract or verbal work agreement with the employer?
0 None
1 Written Contract
2 Verbal Agreement Only
If “written contract” or “verbal agreement only” in Q 72, then go to Q 73. Otherwise, skip to Q 76.

Q 73 [Job Contract II] How well do you understand the details of your written contract or verbal agreement?
1. Extremely well
2. Very well
3. Moderately well
4. Slightly well
5. Not well at all

Q 74 [Job Contract IV] What is the duration of your contract?
1. Permanent
2. Annual
3. Temporary
4. Until your debt to your employer is paid
5. Until your cash advance is paid
6. Other

Q 75 [Job Contract IV] For each of the following areas would you say that your work conditions now are better than your employer promised before you started, the same as promised, different but just as good as originally promised, worse than promised or much worse than originally promised– or were you not makes any promises about this area before starting work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No Promises Made</th>
<th>Much Worse than Promised</th>
<th>Worse than Promised</th>
<th>Different, but Just as Good as Promised</th>
<th>The Same as Promised</th>
<th>Better than Promised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. [Salary] How much you are paid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. [Work Hours] The hours that you must work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. [Work Type] The type of work you do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. [School] Whether you can attend school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. [Housing] Availability of housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. [Food] Availability of food / meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. [Vacations] Vacations / days off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 76 [Work Hour Avg] On a typical work day, how many hours do you work? _____ hrs.

Q 77 [Loan I] Have you ever borrowed money or received a cash advance from your employer?
0. No
1. Yes

If yes to Q 77, then go to Q 78. Otherwise, skip to Q 80.

Q 78 [Loan II] How much did you borrow? Amount: _____ GTQ

Q 79 [Loan II] How long did it take to pay it back?
1. I paid it off in less than a year
2. I paid it off in 1-2 years
3. I paid it off in 3+ years
4. I am still trying to pay back my employer by working unpaid for my employer, and it is feasible to pay back
5. I am still trying to pay back my employer by means other than working unpaid for my employer, and it is feasible to pay back
6. I am still trying to pay back my employer, but it is impossible to pay back
Q 80 [Job Work Environment I] For each of the following please tell me how frequently it has happened to you at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. You have been insulted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. You have been forced to accompany your employer to brothels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. You have been verbally abused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. You have been forced to accompany your employer to bars</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. You have been physically hit or assaulted at work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Your employer shows you excessive affection (e.g., hugs and kisses)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. You have been touched or assaulted sexually against your will</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. You have not been paid for work you did</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. You have been forced to touch people in ways you don’t like</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 81 [Job Work Environment II] Do you feel that you could freely quit your current job if you wanted to?

0     No
1     Yes

If “No” in Q 81, then go to

Q 82. Otherwise, skip to Q 83.

Q 82 [Job Work Environment III (Self)] Why Not? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Your family would not want you to leave
2. You don’t think that you can find another job that would be better
3. You need the money no matter how bad the work is
4. You can’t leave until you repay a debt to your employer
5. You fear that you might be physically harmed
6. You fear that members of your family might be physically harmed
7. You fear that your family members will lose their jobs
8. Other (Please Specify):

Q 83 [Job Work Environment IV] While working, have you ever experienced any of the following situations? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Had passport or other papers taken away so that you could not leave
2. Been forced to work overtime without pay
3. Been prevented from contacting friends or family
4. Had pay withheld by your employer
5. Been forced to pay off a debt to your employer before you could leave
6. Been locked up at night or otherwise physically restrained by your employer
7. Been forced to engage in illegal activities by your employer
8. Been threatened with any of the previous things, even if they were not actually done to force work
9. None of the above

Q 84 [Job Child Labor I] Thinking back on your life, at what age did you begin working for the first time either for pay or without pay beyond basic chores within your own family?

Record age: _______

Q 85 [Job Child Labor II] At what age should a child start working for the first time either for pay or without pay beyond basic chores within your own family? [DO NOT READ OPTIONS]

1. Record age: _______
2. A child should not work
Q 86 [Job Child Labor III] As a child did you ever do the following things?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Beg or collect alms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Break rocks into gravel, roll firecrackers or do other sorts of work at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Worked selling chewing gum/cigarettes on street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Worked in private household doing housework or child care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Work as a shoe shiner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work in the fields or on a farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Transport heavy items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 87 [Job Child Labor IV] Do your children do any of the following things?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Beg or collect alms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Break rocks into gravel, roll firecrackers or do other sorts of work at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Worked selling chewing gum/cigarettes on street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Worked in private household doing housework or child care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Work as a shoe shiner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work in the fields or on a farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Transport heavy items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Module E: Experience with Work Abroad (Individual-Level Questions)

Now we would like to ask you some questions about any experiences you have had working while living away from home either elsewhere in Guatemala or in another country anytime during the past four years (2010-2013).

Q 88 [Home] What city/village would you consider your family home?

Q 89 [Work Abroad I (Self)] Are you currently living away from home due to work?
0 No
1 Yes

If “Yes” to Q 89, then go to Q 91. Otherwise, skip to Q 90.

Q 90 [Work Abroad II (Self)] In the last 3 years, have you moved away from home to work either in another country or in a different part/region of Guatemala?
0 No
1 Yes

If “Yes” to Q 90, then go to Q 91. Otherwise, skip to Q 122.

Q 91 [Work Abroad III (Self)]

A. [If currently away] What year did you move here? What year do you hope to return home?
   Start _____
   End _____

B. [If s/he was away in the past] Think about your most recent time you worked away from home. What year(s) were you away from home?
   Start _____
   End _____

Ask Q 92 only if “Yes” to Q 90. Otherwise, skip to Q 93.

Q 92 [Work Location (Self)] What part/region of Guatemala or country were you working in? [REGION CODE] _____

Q 93 [Migration (Self)]

A. [If currently away] Did you travel here on your own or as part of a group?
   1 Traveled alone
   2 Traveled with family
   3 Traveled with a group of people you know
   4 Traveled with a group of strangers
   5 Traveled with coyote or smuggler

B. [If s/he was away in the past] Did you travel there on your own or as part of a group?
   1 Traveled alone
   2 Traveled with family
   3 Traveled with a group of people you knew
   4 Traveled with a group of strangers
   5 Traveled with coyote or smuggler

Q 94 [List Experiment III] [EXPERIMENT – Randomize between Conditions A, B, C, and D]
I am now going to read you a list of 3/4 statements. As I read you these statements, please keep count in your head of HOW MANY of them are true for you. I don't want to know which ones; just HOW MANY apply to you. Please wait until I've read all of the statements before telling me HOW MANY of them are true for you.

Condition A: Read 1, 2, 3 (randomize order of statements)
Condition B: Read 1, 2, 3, 4 (randomize order of statements)
Condition C: Read 1, 2, 3, 5 (randomize order of statements)
Condition D: Read 1, 2, 3, 6 (randomize order of statements)

1 Your family had enough food to eat while you were away from home.
2 You had all the friends you needed when you worked away from home.
3 You had put money in a savings account when you worked away from home.
4 You were a victim of trafficking when you recently worked away from home.
5 You were exploited at work when you recently worked away from home.
6 You were threatened by your employer if you quit your job away from home.

Q 95 [List Experiment IV] [EXPERIMENT – Randomize between Conditions A, B, C, and D, where people are not assigned to the same conditions they were assigned to list experiment III]
I am now going to read you a list of 3/4 statements. As I read you these statements, please keep count in your head of HOW MANY of them are true for you. I don't want to know which ones; just HOW MANY apply to you.

Condition A: Read 1, 2, 3 (randomize order of statements)
Condition B: Read 1, 2, 3, 4 (randomize order of statements)
Condition C: Read 1, 2, 3, 5 (randomize order of statements)
Condition D: Read 1, 2, 3, 6 (randomize order of statements)
1 You went on vacations during the time you spent away from home.
2 You made enough money to send money home.
3 You did not know many people when you were away from home.
4 You were a victim of trafficking when you recently worked away from home.
5 You were exploited at work when you recently worked away from home.
6 You were threatened by your employer if you quit your job away from home.

If from Q 92, we know that the respondent was outside Guatemala, then go to Q 96. Otherwise, skip to Q 98.

Q 96 [Legal Migration (Self) I] Did you enter the country with all of the necessary legal documents or were you missing some?
0 No, missing some documents
1 Yes, had all documents

Q 97 [Legal Migration (Self) II] Do you suspect that any of your documents might have been falsified by others?
0 No
1 Yes

Q 98 [Work Contact (Self)]
A. [If currently away] Who did you know at this location when you first moved?
   1 Family members / relatives
   2 People from same community
   3 Friends
   4 No One

B. [If s/he was away in the past] Who did you know there when you first moved?
   1 Family members / relative
   2 People from same community
   3 Friends
   4 No One

Q 99 [Motivation (Self)] Why did you decide to leave home for work?
1 You thought the money would be better than your job at home
2 You couldn't find a job where you lived
3 You had to support your family
4 You wanted the adventure
5 You were tricked into going
6 Your family made the decision and you went along
7 Other (Please Specify):

Q 100 [Recruitment I (Self)] Which of the following best describes your situation when you left home for work:
1 Recruited for a specific job
2 Went with promises of some unspecified sort of employment
3 Went without a job
Q 101 [Recruitment II (Self)] How did you find this work?
1. Family members / relatives
2. Friend
3. Person from community / acquaintance
4. Read an ad in the Paper / Heard an ad on the Radio
5. Employment Agency / Recruiter
6. Other (Please Specify):
7. Did not find a job

If answers responde “No encontró empleo” (Preg. 101), pasar a la Preg. 104. De lo contrario, continuar con la siguiente pregunta (Preg. 102).

Q 102 [Recruitment III (Self)] How well did you know the person who helped you find your job?
6. Extremely well
7. Very well
8. Moderately well
9. Slightly well
10. Not well at all

Q 103 [Recruitment IV (Self)] Is the work that you found yourself doing when first moving better or worse than what you expected when you decided to move?
1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. About what I expected
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse

Q 104 [Recruitment V (Self)] Some people tell us that Guatemalans who leave home for work are sometimes deceived about the work and forced either to become prostitutes or to do bad work without pay when they get there. Had you heard any stories like this before you left?
0. No
1. Yes

If “Yes” in Q 104, then go to Q 105. Otherwise, skip to Q 106.

Q 105 [Recruitment VI (Self)] How much did these stories concern you?
1. It didn’t worry me because I thought the stories were not true
2. I thought the stories were true, but I didn’t think it could happen to me.
3. I was worried but I trusted others to protect me
4. I was worried but I needed the money and had to take the risk

Ask Q 106-Q 113 only if they are NOT currently away. For those currently away, skip to Q 114.

Q 106 [Work Environment I (Self)] Before leaving your home to take the job, did you have a written contract or verbal work agreement (outlining wage, benefits, work environment, etc.)?
0. None
1. Written Contract
2. Verbal Agreement Only

If “None” or “Verbal Agreement” in Q 106, then go to Q 107. Otherwise, skip to Q 109.

Q 107 [Work Environment II (Self)] Did you have a written contract or verbal work agreement when you arrived and before you started the work?
1. None
2. Written Contract
3. Verbal Agreement Only

If “None” or “Verbal Agreement” in Q 107, then go to Q 108. Otherwise, skip to Q 109.
Q 108 [Work Environment III (Self)] Did you ever have a written contract or verbal work agreement with the employer?
   1  None
   2  Written Contract
   3  Verbal Agreement Only

If “Written Contract” or “Verbal Agreement” in Q 106, Q 107, or Q 108, then go to Q 109. Otherwise, go to Q 111.

Q 109 [Work Environment IV (Self)] To what extent did your employer honor the terms of your written contract or verbal agreement?
   1  Totally
   2  Almost totally
   3  A moderate amount
   4  A little
   5  None at all

Q 110 [Work Environment V (Self)] Were you paid the promised wage for the work that you did?
   0  No
   1  Yes

Q 111 [Work Environment VI (Self)] Did you feel that you could quit work and return home anytime you wanted?
   0  No
   1  Yes

If “No” in Q 111, go to Q 112. Otherwise, skip to Q 113.

Q 112 [Work Environment VII (Self)] Why Not? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
   1  You felt that your family would not want you to leave
   2  You didn’t think you could find another job that would be better
   3  You needed the money no matter how bad the work was
   4  You could not afford the cost of returning home
   5  You couldn’t leave until you repaid a debt to your employer
   6  You feared that you would be physically harmed if you tried to leave
   7  You feared that family members might be physically harmed if you tried to leave
   8  You feared that family members might lose their jobs if you tried to leave
   9  You didn’t have access to your passport
   10 You feared being reported to immigration authorities

Q 113 [Work Environment VII (Self)] While working, have you ever experienced any of the following situations? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
   1  Had passport or other papers taken away so that you could not leave
   2  Been forced to work without pay
   3  Been forced to work overtime without pay
   4  Been prevented from contacting friends or family
   5  Had pay withheld by your employer
   6  Been forced to pay off a debt to your employer before you could leave
   7  Been locked up at night or otherwise physically restrained by your employer
   8  Been beaten or physically punished by your employer
   9  Been verbally abused by your employer
   10 Been forced to engage in illegal activities by your employer
   11 Been threatened with any of the previous things, even if they were not actually done to force work
   12 None of the above

Q 114 [Contact I (Self)]
   A. [If currently away] How often are you in contact with your family?
      1  Not in contact
      2  Less than once a year
      3  Once a year
      4  A few times (2-4) a year
      5  Several times (5-11) a year
      6  Once a month
      7  More than once a month
B. [If s/he was away in the past] How often were you in contact with your family while you were away?
1. Not in contact
2. Less than once a year
3. Once a year
4. A few times (2-4) a year
5. Several times (5-11) a year
6. Once a month
7. More than once a month

If answered “Not in contact” in Q114, skip to Q116. Otherwise, continue with Q115.

Q115 [Contact II (Self)]
A. [If currently away] What form of communication do you use most frequently to reach home?
   1. Telephone
   2. Letter
   3. Internet (e.g., email)
   4. Face-to-face (within traveling distance)
B. [If s/he was away in the past] What form of communication did you use most frequently to reach home?
   1. Telephone
   2. Letter
   3. Internet (e.g., email)
   4. Face-to-face (within traveling distance)

Q116 [Work Cost (Self)] How much did it cost you or your family for you to migrate for work?
   1. No/none
   2. Less than 1000 GTQ
   3. 1000-5000 GTQ
   4. More than 5000 GTQ

If “recruited for a specific job” in Q100, ask Q117. Otherwise, skip to Q119.

Q117 [Remittances I (Self)] Did you receive money up front for taking the job?
   0. No
   1. Yes

If “Yes” in Q117, ask Q118. Otherwise, skip to Q119.

Q118 [Remittances II (Self)] How much did you receive up front for migrating for work?
   0. No/none
   1. Less than 1000 GTQ
   2. 1000-5000 GTQ
   3. More than 5000 GTQ

Q119 [Remittances III (Self)]
A. [If currently away] Do you ever send money home?
   0. No
   1. Yes
B. [If s/he was away in the past] Did you ever send money home?
   0. No
   1. Yes

If “Yes” in Q119, ask Q120. Otherwise, skip to Q122.
Q 120 [Remittances IV (Self)]
A. [If currently away] How often do you send money home?
   1. Weekly
   2. Bi-weekly
   3. Monthly
   4. Several times a year
   5. A few times a year
   6. Yearly
   7. Almost never
   8. Never
B. [If s/he was away in the past] How often did you send money home?
   1. Weekly
   2. Bi-weekly
   3. Monthly
   4. Several times a year
   5. A few times a year
   6. Yearly
   7. Almost never
   8. Never

Q 121 [Remittances V (Self)]
A. [If currently away] How much money do you send home each month, on average? _______ GTQ
B. [If s/he was away in the past] How much money did you send home monthly, on average? _______ GTQ
VI. Module F: Family Structure (Individual-Level Questions)

I would like to ask more specific questions about your family structure and other household members.

If the respondent was ever married ("married, common law marriage, divorced, separated, or widowed") according to Q 16, go to Q 139. Otherwise, skip to Q 142.

Q 139 [Marriage I] How old were you when you first got married?
   Age: _____

Q 140 [Marriage II] What role did your parents or family play in your decision to marry?
   0 No role at all
   1 You asked for your parents for permission to marry as a formality
   2 You asked your parents for permission and would not have married had they not approved
   3 You parents pressured/required you to marry a particular person

Q 141 [Marriage II] Did your parents receive money (e.g., dowry) for your marriage?
   1 No
   2 Yes

Q 142 [Marriage III] In your opinion, what is the ideal age of marriage for a female?
   1 12-14
   2 15-17
   3 18-20
   4 21-25
   5 Over 25

Q 143 [Marriage IV] In your opinion, what is the ideal age of marriage for a male?
   1 12-14
   2 15-17
   3 18-20
   4 21-25
   5 Over 25

If the respondent has a child according to Q 9 and Q 10 (Q9 or Q10 need to be nonzero), go to Q 144. Otherwise, skip to Q 145.

Q 144 [Child] How old were you when your first child was born? Age: _____

Q 145 [DS I] Does your household have any non-family domestic help – for example for cooking, cleaning, gardening or other house hold work?
   0 No
   1 Yes

If "Yes" in Q 145, go to Q 146. Otherwise, skip to Q 156.

Q 146 [DS II] How many domestic workers does your household have? _____

Q 147 [DS III] What type of job do they do [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
   1 House Maid
   2 Cook
   3 Gardener
   4 Nanny/Teacher
   5 Driver/Chauffer
   6 Butler/man servant
   7 Secretary/Clerical Help
   8 Wash or iron clothes
   9 Other (specify):
Q 148 [DS IV] How long has the youngest member of the staff been employed by the family? _____ [Select appropriate unit] Years, Months, Weeks

I will now ask you some questions about this employee.

Q 149 [DS V] Where is s/he from (country or region of Guatemala)? [REGION CODE]

Q 150 [DS VI] How old is s/he? _____ Years

Q 151 [DS VII] On a typical work day how many hours does s/he work? ____Hrs.

Q 152 [DS VIII] In Guatemala, some people pay their domestic employees cash. Others provide them with room and board instead of cash. Does s/he receive a wage?

0   No
1   Yes

If “Yes” in Q 152, go to Q 153. Otherwise, skip to Q 156.

Q 153 [DS IX] How much is s/he paid per week on average? Amount: ______ GTQ

Q 154 [DS X] Is s/he paid the wage directly or it is paid to someone else on their behalf?

1   Paid Indirectly
2   Paid to someone else
3   No wages paid.

Q 155 [DS XI] Is s/he provided room and board in your home or does s/he go home at night?

1   Lives with the household
2   Goes to a separate home at night
VIII. Module G: Worldview (Individual-Level Questions)

Now I would like to learn your opinion on a variety of topics.

Q 156 [MT] Now, you are going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Companies that employ young people perform better than those that employ older people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. This country pays too much attention to the needs of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rich people have mostly earned the wealth they enjoy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. There is more economic opportunity outside my village than in it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Poor people are mostly to blame for the poverty they experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 157 [MT] [MT = MORAL TRADITIONALISM (FROM ANES)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. This country would have many fewer problems if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. There is too much sexual freedom and loose living today.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 158 [ALTRUISM]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. You have lent a neighbor an item of some value, within the last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. You have given money to a stranger who needed it, within the last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 159 [GII] People disagree on whether the world becoming more connected is a good thing. Some think it is good because it makes Guatemalan society more culturally diverse. Others think it is bad because it diminishes traditional Guatemalan values. Do you think the world becoming more connected is good or bad for Guatemalan society?

1. Very good
2. Somewhat good
3. Neither good nor bad
4. Somewhat bad
5. Very bad

Q 160 [GIII] How threatened do you think the Guatemalan way of life is by foreign influence?

1. Extremely threatened
2. Very threatened
3. Moderately threatened
4. Slightly threatened
5. Not threatened at all

Q 161 [Priorities] The following list includes things that may or may not be important to you. Please tell us how important each one is to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To have money and a comfortable life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To live in secure surroundings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To do something for the good of society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. To be recognized for one’s achievements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUATEMALA C-TIP SURVEY

Final

Q 162 [GM] Who is responsible for managing the money in your household?
1. You, the respondent
2. Your spouse
3. The respondent and spouse, about equally
4. Your father
5. Your mother
6. Your father-in-law
7. Your other-in-law
8. Your Son or daughter
10. Each one on their own
11. Other (Please Specify): ____________________

Q 163 [Gender] Again, I am going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Worldview]

Q 164. As members of the town, we should be more active in questioning the action of our leaders.

Q 165. Women should have equal rights and receive the same treatment as men do.

Q 166. Most people will try to advantage of me if they got a chance.

Q 167 [Control] Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. How much control do you feel you have over life outcomes?
4. A Great Deal of Control
3. A Lot of Control
2. A Moderate Amount of Control
1. A Little Control
0. No Control at all

Q 168 [Hard Work] Some say that in the long run, hard work usually brings a better life. Others say that hard work generally does not bring success, and it is more a matter of luck and connections. How much do you think hard work matters for long-term success?
4. Matters A Great Deal
3. Matters A Lot
2. Matters A Moderate Amount
1. Matters A Little
0. Does Not Matter at All

Q 169 [Friends II] How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives or colleagues?
1. Every Day
2. Several Times a Week
3. Several Times a Month
4. Less than once a month
5. Never
IX. Module H: Prostitution (Individual-Level Questions)

Q 171 [Prostitution III] Again, I am going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Prostitution should be regulated by the government</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Hiring Prostitutes should be a Crime for client (Johns)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Prostitution is an easy way for women without other skills to earn money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 172 [Prostitution IV] How many men do you think visit prostitutes one or more times a year?

1. Virtually all of them
2. Most of them
3. Some of them
4. Only a small minority
5. None

Q 173 [Prostitution V] What is your opinion about men visiting prostitutes?

1. It is a healthy outlet for men’s needs
2. You don’t approve of it but you accept it as part of our culture
3. You don’t approve of it and think the government should make it illegal.
4. You don’t approve of it and would shun anyone you thought engaged in it.
X. Module I: Political Knowledge & Political Interest (Individual-Level Questions)

[EXPERIMENT: Randomly assign respondents to one of 2 conditions (Condition 1 or 2 – experiment to prime individuals to consider politics as a male v. gender-balanced domain), as they may have downstream effects on the political interest of male v. female respondents.]

We would like to ask you a few questions about politics and government in Guatemala.

Q 174 [PK1]

CONDITION 1 [GIVE CARD “K”]

Now we are going to use another card. We would like to know what you think about some politicians from Guatemala. This new card has a ladder with steps numbered 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you strongly dislike the politician and 10 indicates that you strongly like the politician. Tell me if I mention a politician you haven’t heard or you feel you do not know enough about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Strongly Dislike</th>
<th>Strongly Like</th>
<th>Doesn’t Know Them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1a. Manuel Baldizón</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2a. José Rafael Espada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3a. Eduardo Suger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4a. Roberto Alejos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5a. Álvaro Colom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6a. Alvaro Arzú</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONDITION 2 [GIVE CARD “K”]

Now we are going to use another card. We would like to know what you think about some politicians from Guatemala. This new card has a ladder with steps numbered 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you strongly dislike the politician and 10 indicates that you strongly like the politician. Tell me if I mention a politician you haven’t heard or you feel you do not know enough about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Strongly Dislike</th>
<th>Strongly Like</th>
<th>Doesn’t Know Them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1b. Manuel Baldizón</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2b. Roxanna Baldetti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3b. Eduardo Suger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4b. Sandra Torres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5b. Álvaro Colom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6b. Rigoberta Menchú</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For statistical purposes, we would like to know how much information people have about politics and the country...

Q 175 [PK2] How many departments does Guatemala have? [RECORD ANSWER] ________

1. Correct
2. Incorrect

Q 176 [PK3] How long is the presidential term of office in Guatemala? [RECORD ANSWER] ________

A. Correct
B. Incorrect

Q 178 [PK6] What is the name of the current President of the United States of America? [RECORD ANSWER] ________

A. Barack Obama, accept Obama and Barack
1. Correct
2. Incorrect
Q 179 [Media I] How frequently do you access the following at your workplace, at school, at home, an internet cafe or anywhere else?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Radio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Television</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Newspaper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Internet (e.g., web browsing, email)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 180 [Interest I] How interested are you in politics?
1. Extremely interested
2. Very interested
3. Moderately interested
4. Slightly interested
5. Not interested at all

Q 181 [Political Party] Nowadays, when we speak of political leanings, we talk of those on the left and those on the right. Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely left to extremely right. According to the meaning that the terms “left” and “right” have for you, and thinking of your own political leanings, where would you place yourself on this scale?
1. Extremely left
2. Moderately left
3. Slightly left
4. Moderate; middle-of-the-road
5. Slightly right
6. Moderately right
7. Extremely right

[EXPERIMENT: Randomly assign respondents to one of 2 bios]

Bio 1:
Consider Congressperson Alvarez. First elected to Congress in 1992, Congressperson Alvarez is recognized as a national leader with extensive accomplishments on financial services, national security, the economy, and women’s rights. Alvarez is also the co-chair and co-founder of the Human Trafficking Caucus and working to end trafficking locally and internationally.

Bio 2:
Consider Congressperson Alvarez. First elected to Congress in 1992, Congressperson Alvarez is recognized as a national leader with extensive accomplishments on financial services, national security, the economy, and women’s rights.

Q 182 [Exp-Bio I] If Congressperson Alvarez were running in your municipality, would you favor or oppose Alvarez’s candidacy?
1. Strongly favor
2. Weakly favor
3. Neither favor nor oppose
4. Weakly oppose
5. Strongly oppose

Q 183 [Exp-Bio II] [GIVE CARD “K”]
Using this scale once again, where 0 indicates that you strongly dislike the politician and 10 indicates that you strongly like the politician, how would you rate Congressperson Alvarez? _________
XI. **Module J: Participation & Political Trust (Individual-Level Questions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 184 [Vote] Did you vote in the following elections?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Old Enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Guatemalan General Election, 2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Guatemalan General Election, 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q 185 [Trust I] Now I want to ask you how much you trust different leaders and institutions to do what is right for the people of Guatemala. On a scale of 1-5 where 1 means complete trust and 5 means complete Distrust, please tell me how much you trust ______ to do what is right. Tell me if I mention an institution or persons you haven’t heard or you feel you do not know enough about. [Always have President and Congress first and randomize the rest]. |
|--------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Completely Trust | Somewhat Trust | Neither Trust Nor Distrust | Somewhat Distrust | Completely Distrust |
| A. President | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Congress | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Police | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. The Army | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. NGOs such as the Red Cross | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Q 186 [Trust II] For each of the following please tell me how much you trust them to look out for the interests of ordinary citizens. Tell me if I mention an institution you haven’t heard or you feel you do not know enough about. On a scale of 1-5 where 1 means complete trust and 5 means complete Distrust, please tell me how much you trust _____ to do what is right? |
|--------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Completely Trust | Somewhat Trust | Neither Trust Nor Distrust | Somewhat Distrust | Completely Distrust |
| A. Secretaria Contra la Violencia Sexual, Explotación y Trata de Personas | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Ministerio Público | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Dirección General de Migración | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Secretaría de Bienestar Social de la Presidencia | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Procuraduría de Derechos Humanos | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. Procuraduría General de la Nacion (PGN) | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Q 187 [Bribe] Now we want to talk about your personal experience with things that happen in everyday life. In the last 12 months… [Note that you should only ask “B” if the respondent has had contact with the institution.] |
|--------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-- |--
XII. Module K: Income / Assets (Individual-Level Questions)

Now we would like to ask you some questions about your economic situation.

Q 190 [Assets] Which of the following items do you have in your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. RADIO / TELEVISION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. TELEPHONE / CELLULAR PHONE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MOTORCYCLE / CAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. ANIMALS (E.G., GOAT, SHEEP, COWS, HORSES, ETC.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. LARGE AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY (E.G., TRACTOR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. INDOOR PLUMBING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. REFRIGERATOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 192 [Home] The household that you live in is:
1. Your own and completely paid off
2. Your own and still paying
3. Rented
4. Borrowed or transferred
5. Other (please specify):

Q 193 [Job Pay] Into which of the following income ranges does the total monthly income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children? [If the interviewee does not get it, ask: “What is the total monthly income in your household?”
1. No income
2. Less than 500 quetzals
3. Between 501 and 750 quetzals
4. Between 751 and 1000 quetzals
5. Between 1001 and 1500 quetzals
6. Between 1501 and 2000 quetzals
7. Between 2001 and 2500 quetzals
8. Between 2501 and 3000 quetzals
9. Between 3001 and 3500 quetzals
10. Between 3501 and 4000 quetzals
11. Between 4001 and 4500 quetzals
12. Between 4501 and 5000 quetzals
13. Between 5001 and 6000 quetzals
14. Between 6001 and 7000 quetzals
15. Between 7001 and 8000 quetzals
16. Between 8001 and 10000 quetzals
17. More than 10000 quetzals

Q 194 [Access] For each of the following items, does your household have access to it all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or never?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Clean water for drinking and cooking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Food for everyone to eat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Medical care when needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Electricity at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 196 [Satisfaction] In general how satisfied are you with your life? Would you say that you are:
1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

Q 197 [Economic Situation] How would you describe Guatemala’s overall economic situation? Would you say that the country’s situation is:
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Neither good nor bad (fair)
4. Poor
5. Very poor
Q 199 [Relative Wealth I] In your opinion, relative to others in your community, how poor is your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Moderately Poor</th>
<th>Slightly Poor</th>
<th>Neither Poor Nor Rich</th>
<th>Slightly Rich</th>
<th>Moderately Rich</th>
<th>Very Rich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII. Module L: Other Demographics (Individual-Level Questions)

Now I would like to ask you a few more questions.

Q 200 [Language] What is the primary language that you speak? Do you speak any others? [OPEN-ENDED, PRE-CODED; ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES IN ORDER]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1st response</th>
<th>2nd response</th>
<th>3rd response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakchiquel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekchi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garifuna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 201 [Religion I] What is your religion, if any? [Do not read options. If the respondent says that he/she has no religion, then choose NA – code "88"]

1 Catholic
2 Protestant, Mainline Protestant or Protestant non-Evangelical (Christian; Calvinist; Lutheran; Methodist; Presbyterian; Disciple of Christ; Anglican; Episcopalian; Moravian)
3 Evangelical and Pentecostal (Evangelical; Pentecostals; Church of God; Assemblies of God; Universal Church of the Kingdom of God; International Church of the Foursquare Gospel; Christ Pentecostal Church; Christian Congregation; Mennonite; Brethren; Christian Reformed Church; Charismatic non-Catholic; Light of World; Baptist; Nazarene; Salvation Army; Adventist; Seventh-Day Adventist; Sara Nossa Terra)
4 Jehovah’s Witness
5 Non-Christian Eastern Religions (Islam; Buddhist; Hinduism; Taoist; Confucianism; Baha’i).
6 LDS (Mormon)
7 Traditional Religions or Native Religions (Candomblé, Voodoo, Rastafarian, Mayan Traditional Religion; Umbanda; Maria Lonza; Inti; Kardecista, Santo Daime, Esoterica)
8 Jewish (Orthodox; Conservative; Reform)
9 Other (Please Specify):

Q 203 [Religion IV] How often do you attend religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

1 Every week
2 Almost every week
3 Once or twice a month
4 A few times a year
5 Never

[EXPERIMENT: Randomize between the 2 income questions – the questions are designed to prime individuals to feel relatively poor or well off]

INCOME A

Q 204 [IncomeA] Think about the last 30 days. Into which of the following income ranges does the total last month income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children? [If the interviewee does not get it, ask: "What is the total monthly income in your household?"]

1 Less than 250 GTQ /mo
2 251-500 GTQ /mo
3 501-1000Q GTQ /mo
4 1001-2000Q GTQ /mo
5 2001-4000Q GTQ /mo
6 More than 4,000 GTQ /mo
INCOME B

(Income B) Think about the last 30 days. Into which of the following income ranges does the total last month income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children? [If the interviewee does not get it, ask: “What is the total monthly income in your household?”

1 Less than 2,500 GTQ /mo
2 2,501-5000 GTQ /mo
3 5001-10,000 GTQ /mo
4 10,001-15,000 GTQ /mo
5 15,001-20,000 GTQ /mo
6 More than 20,000 GTQ /mo

Q 205 [Risk 2] If given a choice which job would you choose for your child?
0 A job which pays 10,000 GTQs a month but with a high chance of serious exploitation
1 A job which pays 2,000 GTQs per month but with a low chance of serious exploitation

Q 206 [Risk 3] Imagine you are playing a game where you bet on the outcome when someone flips a coin. You can choose which of the following situations you would like to be in, a situation of more or less certainty. We are not actually going to play this game – this is just an imaginary situation.
0 You receive 1250 GTQ regardless of whether it is heads or tails
1 You receive 1000 GTQ if it is heads, 2000 GTQ if it is tails
2 You receive 750 GTQ if it is heads, 2250 GTQ if it is tails
3 You receive 500 GTQ if it is heads, 3500 GTQ if it is tails
4 You receive 0 GTQ if it is heads, 5000 GTQ if it is tails

[For those who are not trafficking victims] Thank you for your time. We are now completed with the survey.
XIV. Module M: Trafficking Victim Module (Only Ask Trafficking Victims)

We would like to ask you a few additional questions about your working experiences.

[Experience of Trata: For individuals who satisfy at least one of the following two criteria will be asked to respond to this battery:

a. Say that they have been victims of Trata
   a) If response to Q47 is "1. YES"; or
   b) If response to Q64 is "4"; or
   c) If response to Q65 is "4"; or
   d) If response to Q94 is "4"; or
   e) If response to Q95 is "4"; or

b. Whose responses to previous questions indicate that they have been victims whether they perceive themselves to be according to the following guidelines:
   • If responses to Q80e is 3, 4, or 5; or
   • If responses to Q80f is 3, 4, or 5; or
   • If responses to Q80g is 3, 4, or 5; or
   • If responses to Q80h is 3, 4, or 5; or
   • If responses to Q80i is 3, 4, or 5; or
   • If response to Q82 is 4, 5, 6, 7; or
   • If response to Q1112 5, 6, 7, 8, and/or 9; or
   • If in Q83 any item is marked
   • If in Q113 any item is marked.

For those in category a): You previously said that you were a victim of Trata earlier in your life, I would like to ask you just a few more questions about your experience. [Continue with Q 208]

For those in category b): Your responses regarding the nature of your work experiences suggest that you probably have been a victim of Trafficking according to standard definitions [Read definition from card].

Q 207 [trata1] Ask of b) only: Have you ever considered the possibility that you were a victim of trafficking?

0  No
1  Yes

I would like to ask you just a few more questions about your experience.

Q 208 [trata2] How old were you when you were first forced to work against your will? Age _____

Q 209 [trata3] What form of coercion did you suffer? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1   Forced prostitution
2   Sexual exploitation
3   Forced labor or services
4   Forced begging
5   Irregular adoptions
6   Slavery
7   Forced/false marriage

Q 210 [trata4] How many years did you work in this situation of coercion? _____ Years

Q 211 [trata5] How did the experience end? In other words, how did you get away from being forced to work?

1   You escaped or ran away without permission
2   Your employer released you from the work
3   You were rescued by the police or other authorities
4   You were rescued by my family or friends
5   You grew too old to do the work
6   You paid off your debt
7   You are still being forced to work
Q 212 [trata6a] How much support have you received from your family and friends after your experience ended?
1 A great deal
2 A lot
3 A moderate amount
4 A little
5 None at all

Q 213 [trata6b] How much support have you received from your community (e.g., your neighbors) after your experience ended?
1 A great deal
2 A lot
3 A moderate amount
4 A little
5 None at all

Q 214 [trata6c] I will now read you two statements. Please tell me which of the two statements is closest to your view?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument A</th>
<th>Strong Agree with A</th>
<th>Moderate Agree with A</th>
<th>Slightly Agree with A</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Agree with B</th>
<th>Moderately Agree with B</th>
<th>Strongly Agree with B</th>
<th>Argument B</th>
<th>Some people say...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Members of your town blame you for what happened to you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B. Members of your town say that you were taken advantage of and victimized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 215 [trata6d] How satisfied were you with any of the following services you received after your human trafficking experience ended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Didn't Receive Any Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Medical care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Legal services to prosecute your traffickers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Shelter and reintegration services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Psychological support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Protection from your traffickers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ask Q 216 if <=6 in Q 211. Otherwise, skip to Q 218.

Q 216 [trata7a] Have you ever been forced to work against your will since then?
0 No
1 Yes

Q 217 [trata7b] Was it in the same type of forced labor as the first time or different?
1 Same form
2 Different

Q 218 [trata8] Which of the following individuals, if any, would you blame for your having been trafficked? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
1 Boyfriend or girlfriend
2 Father
3 Mother
4 Another family member (non-parent: e.g., uncle, aunt, cousin, sibling, etc.)
5 Friend
6 Police or military member
7 A gang or gang members
8 A coyote
9 A recruiter
10 Someone else who you didn’t previously know
11 Other (please specify): ____________
Q 219 [Health Consequences of Trafficking] Did you have any health problems prior to the forced work situation you have told me about? If so, what were they? [FIRST ASK AS AN OPEN-ENDED QUESTION, THEN PRESENT THE FOLLOWING LIST AND MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Physical Health
   a. Muscle pain or joint pain,
   b. Headaches/trouble thinking clearly
   c. Stomach pain or ulcers
   d. High blood pressure
   e. Chest pain or trouble breathing; heart problems
   f. Congenital deformities (for example, club foot, cleft palate) or other physical disabilities
   g. Infectious disease (TB, chronic diarrhea, etc.)
   h. Rashes, itching, cuts or ulcers on the skin
   i. General health (e.g., general fatigue, chronic cough, etc.)
   j. Diagnosis of cancer
   k. Diagnosis of diabetes

2. Mental Health (depression, anxiety, persistent nightmares, panic attacks)

3. Substance Abuse and Misuse (use or overuse of alcohol, street drugs, injection drugs, uppers/downers, drugs that cause hallucinations/visions/sounds)

4. Sexual and Reproductive Health
   a. Bleeding or discharge (pus) from the vagina, bladder, rectum
   b. (for women) History of miscarriage or abortion
   c. Sexually transmitted disease (HIV, TB, hepatitis, chronic diarrhea, etc.)

5. Dental Health (i.e., trauma-related)

If any item in Q 219 is marked, then go to Q 220. Otherwise, skip to Q 221.

Q 220 [trata10] Have you gotten these conditions treated? What kind of treatment?
   1. Yes, you have received medication to treat your condition
   2. Yes, you have received physical therapy to treat your condition
   3. Yes, you have received mental therapy or counseling to treat your condition
   4. No, you have received no treatment

Q 221 [trata11] Do not tell me the results, but have you ever been tested for HIV?
   0. No
   1. Yes

If any item in Q 219 is marked, then go to Q 222. Otherwise, skip to Q 223.

Q 222 [trata12] How much has the (pre-existing) problems worsened as a result of your work you have been forced or pressured to do?
   1. A great deal
   2. A lot
   3. A moderate amount
   4. A little
   5. None at all

Q 223 [trata13] Do you have any new health problems that you think are a result of this work?
   0. No problems
   1. Some problems
   2. Major problems

If “Some problems” or “Major Problems” in Q 223, then go to Q 224. Otherwise, skip to Q 225.

Q 224 [trata14] What are these problems? [FIRST ASK AS AN OPEN-ENDED QUESTION, THEN PRESENT THE FOLLOWING LIST AND MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Physical Health
   a. Muscle pain or joint pain,
   b. Headaches/trouble thinking clearly
   c. Stomach pain or ulcers
d. High blood pressure
e. Chest pain or trouble breathing; heart problems
f. Congenital deformities (for example, club foot, cleft palate) or other physical disabilities
g. Infectious disease (TB, chronic diarrhea, etc.)
h. Rashes, itching, cuts or ulcers on the skin
i. General health (e.g., general fatigue, chronic cough, etc.)
j. Diagnosis of cancer
k. Diagnosis of diabetes

2. Mental Health (depression, anxiety, persistent nightmares, panic attacks)
3. Substance Abuse and Misuse (use or overuse of alcohol, street drugs, injection drugs, uppers/downers, drugs that cause hallucinations/visions/sounds)
4. Sexual and Reproductive Health
   a. Bleeding or discharge (pus) from the vagina, bladder, rectum
   b. (for women) History of miscarriage or abortion
   c. Sexually transmitted disease (HIV, TB, hepatitis, chronic diarrhea, etc.)
5. Dental Health (i.e., trauma-related)

Q 225 [trata15] Have you lost weight as a result of this forced work?
0. No
1. Yes

If “Yes” to any item in Q 224, then go to Q 226. Otherwise, skip to Q 229.

Q 226 [trata19] Have you sought health care for your problems?
0. No
1. Yes

If “Yes” in Q 226, then go to

Q 227. Otherwise, skip to Q 229.

Q 227 [trata20] Where have you sought health care? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
1. From a friend, family, neighbor, etc.
2. Public Hospital
3. Private Hospital
4. Health clinic
5. Private clinic or physician
6. Traditional healer
7. Pharmacy

Q 228 [trata21] Do you still receive care? How often?
1. Yes, Weekly
2. Yes, Monthly
3. Yes, Annually
4. Other (specify)
5. No

Q 229 [trata23] Were you allowed to seek medical help during your bad work experience?
0. No
1. Yes

If “Yes” in Q 229, then go to Q 230. Otherwise, skip to Q 240.

Q 230 [trata24] Were you able to choose where to get health care?
0. No
1. Yes

Q 231 [trata25] Who paid for your health care?
1. You personally
2. A family member
3. A boss or employer
4. Other
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Q 232 [trata26] Were you accompanied by your employee or someone who worked for your employer when you went to the health care provider?
   0  No
   1  Yes

Q 233 [trata27] Did you provide your real identity when you went to the health care provider?
   0  No
   1  Yes

Q 234 [trata28] Did you have to work through a translator when seeing the health care provider?
   0  No
   1  Yes

If “Yes” in Q 234, then go to Q 235. Otherwise, skip Q 235.

Q 235 [trata29] If Yes, who served as the translator?
   1  Employer
   2  Someone who worked for your employer
   3  Clinic staff
   4  Someone in your group
   5  Other (Please Specify):

If “Yes” to any item in Q 224, then ask Q 236. Otherwise, skip to Q 240.

Q 236 [trata30] Are you better or worse now?
   1  Much Better
   2  Somewhat Better
   3  About the Same
   4  Somewhat Worse
   5  Much Worse

Q 237 [trata31] How satisfied were you with the services?
   1  Extremely satisfied
   2  Very satisfied
   3  Moderately satisfied
   4  Slightly satisfied
   5  Not satisfied at all

If not “Extremely satisfied,” ask Q 238. Otherwise, skip to Q 239.

Q 238 [trata32] Why were you not fully satisfied?
   1  Did not trust the doctor
   2  Was not treated with respect
   3  Felt rushed
   4  Unable to speak privately with the health care provider
   5  Care/treatment too expensive
   6  Medication too expensive
   7  Unable to follow doctors directions
   8  Too far away
   9  Other (please specify): __________

Q 239 [trata33] Did the health care staff ever ask you about your freedom on the job (e.g., whether you are allowed to keep your own work documents like passport, have permission to come and go, or abused at work)?
   0  No
   1  Yes
Q 240 [trata34] Which, if any, of the following conditions did you experience during your period of forced labor? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Unhealthy chemicals (liquid or gas) that could have been inhaled, or sprayed, or in contact with your skin
2. Heavy dust or other breathing irritants (such as fibers from plants or materials, pesticides, agricultural products)
3. Unsanitary conditions - including insect and rodent infestation
4. No toilets or sinks
5. No drinking water
6. No break time
7. Exposure to diseases
8. Repetitive work (with your fingers, hands, arms, legs)
9. Heavy lifting (hard manual labor)
10. Very noisy environment
11. Very crowded work or living conditions

Thank you for your time. We are now completed with the survey.
XV. Module N: Enumerator Impressions (Do Not Ask Respondents – Questions for Enumerators)

Q 241 [Interview Impressions I] Interview End Time: __ __ : __ __ (24 hour clock)

Q 242 [Interview Impressions II] Did the interview have any problems that would impact the integrity of the questions?
   1. No problems
   2. Some problems
   3. Major problems

Q 243 [Interview Impressions III] What socioeconomic class is the respondent?
   1. A: upper middle class
   2. B: middle class
   3. C1: lower middle class
   4. C2: skilled working class
   5. D / E: working class & lowest levels of subsistence

Q 244 [Interview Impressions IV] How well did the respondent understand the survey questions?
   1. Extremely well
   2. Moderately well
   3. Somewhat well
   4. Slightly well
   5. Not well at all

Q 245 [Interview Impressions V] How willing was the respondent in sharing information?
   1. Extremely willing
   2. Moderately willing
   3. Somewhat willing
   4. Slightly willing
   5. Not willing at all

Q 246 [Interview Impressions VI] Do you think the respondent was concentrating throughout the interview?
   1. Concentrated throughout
   2. Sometimes lost concentration
   3. Distracted throughout

Q 247 [Interview Impressions VII] Which of the following statements best describes the interview situation?
   1. Private location, only the respondent and I were present
   2. One or several people were present, but did not interrupt the interview
   3. One or several people were present, and did interrupt (e.g., talk to the respondent) the interview

If answered 2 or 3 in Q 234, then go to Q 235. Otherwise, skip to Q 235

Q 248 [Interview Impressions VIII] What gender were the other people present during the interview?
   0. Male only
   1. Female only
   2. Both male and female

Q 249 [Interview Impressions VIII] In answering the survey questions, how comfortable did the respondent see to be?
   1. Extremely comfortable / at ease
   2. Moderately comfortable / at ease
   3. Somewhat comfortable / at ease
   4. Slightly comfortable / at ease
   5. Not comfortable at all / Uneasy