

REINTEGRATION in Aftercare: Theory and Practice

*Developing an instrument to measure success of reintegration
of traffic survivors; formulating a philosophy and program
of reintegration based on the instrument*

**By Gundelina A. Velazco, PhD
Director of Asia Aftercare
Love146**

**Paper presented at the
2011 Interdisciplinary Conference on Human Trafficking**

What we know and what we need to know.

September 29 - October 01, 2011

Lincoln, Nebraska



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
Objectives.....	4
Methods.....	4
Results and Discussion.....	6
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	7
Acknowledgments.....	7
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES.....	8
INTRODUCTION.....	9
BACKGROUND.....	9
OBJECTIVES.....	11
METHODS.....	11
Survey.....	11
<i>Survey sites.....</i>	11
<i>Sampling.....</i>	12
<i>Tool.....</i>	13
<i>Data Gathering.....</i>	14
<i>Data Analysis.....</i>	15
Field testing.....	15
<i>Field Testing Sites.....</i>	15
<i>Sampling.....</i>	16
<i>Tool.....</i>	17
<i>Data Gathering.....</i>	17
<i>Data Analysis.....</i>	17
Reliability and Validity Study.....	17
Reliability.....	18
<i>Inter-rater Reliability of the Test as a Whole.....</i>	18
<i>Inter-rater Reliability per Item.....</i>	19
Validity.....	19
<i>Content Validity.....</i>	19
<i>Expert Judgment Validity.....</i>	19
<i>Criterion-Related Validity.....</i>	19
RESULTS.....	19
Survey Results.....	19
Field Testing Results.....	19

Reliability	19
<i>Inter-rater Reliability of the Test as a Whole.....</i>	19
<i>Inter-rater Reliability of each Item.....</i>	22
 Validity.....	23
<i>Content Validity.....</i>	23
<i>Expert Judgment Validity.....</i>	23
<i>Criterion-Related Validity.....</i>	24
 DISCUSSION.....	25
<i>Survey Results.....</i>	25
<i>Field Testing Results.....</i>	26
<i>A Philosophy of Reintegration.....</i>	26
<i>A Case Study.....</i>	30
 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	31
 REFERENCES.....	32
 APPENDIX A: Obtaining Consent to Answer the Survey Question, Reintegration Study.....	34
APPENDIX B: Reintegration Success Instrument, Survivor's Version.....	35
APPENDIX C: Reintegration Success Instrument, Rater's Version.....	42
APPENDIX D: Brief Resume of Prof. Antero Arias, Jr.....	49
APPENDIX E: Categories of Perceptions of Elements of Successful Reintegration with Brief Explanations.....	50
APPENDIX F: Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Survivor and Rater on Each Item of the Reintegration Success Instrument..	63

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objectives

This is a report on: 1) the survey of the relevant populations' perceived indicators of successful reintegration of traffic survivors; 2) the development of an instrument to measure level of success of reintegration, based on the survey results; 3) the field-testing of the draft instrument with another relevant population to determine its reliability and validity; and 4) initiation of a reintegration philosophy and program based on the indicators in the instrument.

The reintegration program consists of implementing the indicators in the instrument in helping the reintegrated girls of Love146, a US-based NGO that works toward the abolition of child sex exploitation and trafficking and the restoration of the victims. This report includes a case study of one of these girls, wherein the instrument was also used to evaluate the reintegration assistance given her and her family.

The objectives of the work reported here are:

1. To find out what the relevant populations perceive as indicators of successful reintegration of traffic survivors ;
2. To draft an instrument measuring success of reintegration, based on the gathered perceptions;
3. To field-test the instrument in order to establish reliability and validity; and
4. To initiate a program of reintegration with reintegrated girls based on the indicators in the instrument, and to evaluate the program using the instrument.

Methods

This study took place from January 2009 to February 2010. The first step was to decide on the setting for the survey: 11 areas of Mindanao, the southern island of the Philippines, which is known as the back door for children being trafficked into neighboring countries, and where many of these children have been reintegrated. Then, the three different forms of the survey question that gathered the respondents' perceptions of successful reintegration were formulated. The three forms of the question were translated by a professional translator for each of the three dialects spoken by the respondents. Six adults and six children speaking the dialects were consulted as to the clarity of these questions, and revisions were made based on their comments.

The translations were back-translated into English by another translator for each dialect. Discrepancies were sorted out. The sampling for the three forms of the question was determined, with each subject answering only one form of the question. The interviewers were trained in the use of tape recorders and obtaining consent for it; making an accurate, verbatim, and complete recording of the responses; and proper interaction with the respondents, as well as giving the respondents information on what the research was all about, and then obtaining their consent to be part of the research.

The respondents for this survey consisted of 67 traffic survivors who were below 18 when they were trafficked and were below 25 at the time of the survey, 16 parents, 9 NGOs, 2 government organizations, and 5 government authorities. The respondents' responses were translated into English. The English translation was back-translated into the dialects by another translator for each dialect. Discrepancies were sorted out. The responses were encoded. Researchers were trained in content-analysis. The encoded responses were content-analyzed in a workshop type of process, and a consensus was sought for each response.

The next step was to construct the instrument that will measure degree of success of reintegration, based on the content-analyzed responses.

The resulting instrument was then tested in the reliability and validity testing phase, the purpose of which was to find out whether the instrument could accurately determine the degree of success of reintegration of traffic survivors.

Testing consisted of assessing the instrument's content validity, criterion validity, and inter-rater reliability on the test as a whole and on each item.

First, the instrument was content-validated by an expert.

The instrument was then translated into the three dialects spoken by the respondents by a translator for each dialect. It was back-translated into English by another group of translators. Discrepancies were sorted out, and the instrument was finalized for field testing.

The instrument was then field-tested with another group of respondents from other areas of Mindanao. This second group of respondents consisted of 55 traffic survivors who were trafficked when they were below 18 and were below 25 at the time of the field testing, and 55 raters composed of relatives mostly mothers, social workers and friend, from other 11 areas of Mindanao. Again, the interviewers were trained in the use of tape recorders and obtaining consent for it; making an accurate, verbatim, and complete recording of the responses, and proper interaction with the respondents, as well as giving the respondents information on what the research was all about and obtaining their consent to be a respondent.

The means and standard deviations of the respondents' scores were computed, in order to obtain a picture of the scores' average and variability.

Kappa coefficient, which is a statistical measure of inter-rater agreement for categorical items, was computed on the ratings of each pair of raters on all of the multiple choice items of the instrument, in order to obtain the degree of inter-rater agreement of raters on the test as a whole. The significance of the kappa coefficients was also tested.

Kappa coefficient and its test of significance were also computed on all pairs of raters' scores on each item in order to determine item reliability and which item should be retained or discarded.

Criterion-related validity was assessed by correlating the survivors' scores on the instrument with their answers to the question of whether they were generally satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, which served as the criterion, on a scale of 1 to 4, using Pearson correlation coefficient.

The elements identified in the survey and constructed instrument were formed into a philosophy of reintegration and implemented as interventions for the reintegrated girls of Love146. This report includes a case study of one of the girls, as well as feedback from the girl and her mother, after the interventions.

Results and Discussion

The survey of the respondents' perceptions of what makes for successful reintegration yielded 62 categories of responses, which made more specific and fleshed out the general prescriptions that have previously been written in the literature. These responses were constructed into a 42-item questionnaire on successful reintegration, with equivalent items for the traffic survivor and for the rater who is familiar with the survivor's circumstances.

The field testing mean score of the survivors on the instrument is 70.47 ($SD=23.49$) out of a possible 144, which is 48.94%. The mean item score is 1.96 ($SD=.65$) out of a possible 4.0, which is between "Not at all" and "To a little extent", referring to the perceived degree of reintegration assistance they were receiving.

Reliability. Kappa statistic of each pair of raters on the entire test revealed a mean coefficient of $k = .59$, which is moderate. The kappa coefficients range from "Slight agreement" to "almost perfect agreement". The coefficients of "almost perfect agreement" all came from mother-daughter and mother-son pairs, although not all mother-daughter and mother-son pairs had "almost perfect agreement".

Kappa coefficients on all pairs of raters per item revealed a mean coefficient of $k = .599$, which is moderate. The coefficients range from "fair" to "almost perfect agreement", with no coefficient lower than fair, meaning that the items were generally reliable.

Validity. Deriving the contents of the instrument from the perceptions of the relevant population grounded the items of the instrument in the experience of the subjects. Content validity was further ascertained by subjecting the instrument to the scrutiny of an expert judge – a professor and master's degree holder of psychology and certified specialist in assessment and in clinical psychology.

The Pearson correlation coefficient of .81 ($df = 54$, $z = 5.96$, significant at $< .001$) between the subjects' total scores and their answers to the question of whether they are

satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, indicates high criterion-related validity.

Implementation of the Formulated Reintegration Program: Case Study. The girl in the case study and her mother were also administered the constructed instrument one year after the reintegration interventions given by Love146. The girl scored 124 out of 144 on the instrument, which is 86.11%, compared to the 48.94% of the field testing group. Her mean item score is 3.44 out of a possible 4.0, which is between “To a moderate extent” and “To a very great extent”, compared to 1.96 of the field testing group. The girl’s and her mother’s scores yielded a kappa coefficient of 0.755102 ($z=3.253817$) which is significant at .001. Given the demonstrated reliability and validity of the instrument, there is reason to have confidence that the results reflect reality to a reasonable degree.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The survey has yielded comprehensive, empirical data on elements of successful reintegration from the voices of the affected populations themselves. The respondents’ responses also gave some ideas on specific measures that could be done to make reintegration successful.

The instrument that was derived from the survey results demonstrated adequate validity and reliability and can be used to measure success of reintegration of traffic survivors.

The girl in the case study in this report, as well as her adult rater, gave favorable feedback on the reintegration interventions provided her. The interventions could be replicated with other traffic survivors.

The instrument could be used both as one of the evaluation tools and as a guide by NGOs as well as government agencies in the Philippines, which are working toward the reintegration of their clients and wanting to determine whether their efforts have been effective, from the perspective of the affected populations. The instrument could also be refined further. Alternatively, organizations wanting to evaluate their reintegration efforts can also systematically derive their evaluation tool from the actual situation and experiences of the people who will respond to the evaluation measure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by Love146, an organization that is dedicated to the abolition of child sex slavery and the rehabilitation of the survivors. I also wish to thank the traffic survivors, their families, the government and non-government personnel, and other members of the communities in Mindanao, who provided the data for the survey and for the field testing.

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

List of Tables

- Table 1: Distribution of subjects for the survey by type, gender, and site
- Table 2: Distribution of subjects for the field testing: survivors by gender and site; raters by site and relationship to survivor
- Table 3: Frequency of survivors by age at the time of the field testing
- Table 4: Kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on the entire test, their magnitude, and significance
- Table 5: Kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on each of the 36 multiple choice items of the instrument
- Table 6: Survivors' mean item scores and response to the question of whether they were generally satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, on a scale of 1 to 4 (4 being the most satisfied) which served as the criterion, using Pearson correlation coefficient

List of Figures

- Figure 1: Survey sites in the island of Mindanao
- Figure 2: Field testing sites in the island of Mindanao

INTRODUCTION

Children who have been rescued from trafficking and returned to their families or points of origin are in danger of being re-victimized if proper measures are not taken to protect them. “Trafficked persons are highly vulnerable to re-trafficking immediately after having exited a trafficking situation and en route to assistance. Victims of trafficking are frequently re-trafficked within two years or less of having exited a trafficking situation. Studies report rates of re-trafficking from 11% to as high as 50%” (Jobe, 2010).

This study aimed to explore what it takes for reintegration to be successful, based on the perceptions of the relevant populations, and for the survivor to be protected from being trafficked again.

An exploration of the community’s perception of successful reintegration was first conducted. From these gathered perceptions, a measuring tool was constructed and then tested for clarity, validity and reliability among the target populations. This report describes the methods used to develop and test the instrument and the results of these tests. The report also describes the reintegration program being implemented by Love146, based on the indicators in the instrument. The report presents the case of one of the girls who are part of the reintegration program.

BACKGROUND

Love146 works toward the abolition of child sex slavery and exploitation and the rehabilitation of the victims. Love146 programs include prevention, advocacy, and aftercare (www.love146.org).

We define aftercare as the systematic process of holistic care provided for victims of child sex slavery and exploitation, after they are rescued or taken out from such situation. The Love146 Aftercare Program runs a safe home, trains workers in different countries in the care of victims, and conducts research on relevant topics.

Such a research topic came up when workers being trained by Love146 repeatedly expressed the need for a better system of reintegrating trafficked victims, because many of those who have been reintegrated with their communities end up being re-trafficked, or go through life without hope for a better future. It was deemed necessary to find out the specific elements that would make reintegration successful, so that the survivor is able to live a satisfactory life in the community and does not end up being re-trafficked. It was also deemed necessary that this question be answered by the affected population themselves - the survivors, their family, and the community.

The report of the Strategic Information Response Network (SIREN) of the United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP) (Lisborg, 2009) is a summary of lessons learned from interviews with 59 Filipina and Thai self-returned and assisted victims of trafficking to determine their real needs, challenges, and desires, and

how the reintegration assistance they received helped or hindered their recovery. While the UNIAP report included victims trafficked for labor or sex, this study focuses on children trafficked for sex.

In “*Monitoring Anti-Trafficking Re/Integration Programmes. A Manual*” (Surtees, 2010), successful reintegration is defined in the Trafficking Victims Re/Integration Programme (TVRP) as “recovery and economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. It includes settlement in a stable and safe environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, and opportunities for personal, social and economic development and access to social and emotional support. It may involve returning to one’s family and/or community of origin; it may also involve integration in a new community and even in a new country. TVRP criteria for determining if an individual has been successfully re/integrated are the following: 1) safe and affordable accommodation, 2) legal status, 3) professional/employment opportunities, 4) education and training opportunities, 5) security and safety, 6) healthy social environment (including anti-discrimination and anti-marginalization), 7) social well-being and positive interpersonal relations, 8) economic well-being/viability, 9) physical well-being, 10) mental well-being, 11) access to services and opportunities, 12) motivation and commitment to re/integration process, 13) legal issues and court proceedings, and 14) well-being of secondary beneficiaries.”

Whilst the TVRP definition is based on experiences of NGOs in Europe, this study sought a definition of “successful reintegration” that is based on the verbalizations of the affected populations themselves – the victims, relatives, and the community in the Philippines, where trafficking is rampant and where many of the victims have been reintegrated and could speak from experience.

Based on the subjects’ responses, the next question then was how to share the findings and process with concerned helping groups in the country, in order to help guide their reintegration efforts with similar groups of people. An instrument measuring success of reintegration, based on the survey subjects’ responses, was deemed as an effective approach. Such an instrument, if proven reliable and valid, could serve as a guide on what reintegration assistance to give, and also as an evaluation tool to measure whether reintegration was successful.

Love146 could also then implement a reintegration program based on the elements identified in the instrument and evaluate the program using the instrument.

Rather than “victims”, the word “survivors” is preferred in this report and will be used from here on.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the work reported here are:

1. To find out what the relevant populations perceive as indicators of successful reintegration of traffic survivors ;
2. To draft an instrument measuring success of reintegration, based on the gathered perceptions;
3. To field-test the instrument in order to establish its reliability and validity; and
4. To initiate a program of reintegration with reintegrated girls based on the indicators in the instrument, and to evaluate the program using the instrument.

METHODS

The study started around January 2009 and was finished around February 2010.

Survey

Survey sites

The survey took place in 11 areas of Mindanao, the southern island of the Philippines, which is known as the back door for children being trafficked into neighboring countries, and where many of these children have been reintegrated. The sites are: Cagayan de Oro, Butuan, Sultan Kudarat, Davao, Dipolog, Pagadian, Ipil, Camiguin Island, Misamis Oriental, Zamboanga City, and Bukidnon.

Figure 1 shows the survey sites in the island of Mindanao

Figure 1: Survey sites in the island of Mindanao, Philippines (yellow circles)



Sampling

The survey respondents consisted of 67 traffic survivors, 16 parents, 9 NGOs, 2 government organizations, and 5 government authorities. The survivors were recommended by organizations that have worked with them. They were below 18 when they were trafficked and below 25 at the time of the survey during the early part of 2009.

Below is the distribution of subjects for the survey by type, gender, and site.

Table 1. Distribution of subjects for the survey by type, gender, and site

Site	Survivors (67)		Parents (16)		NGO (9)		GO (2)		GA (5)	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	2	65	3	13	0	9	0	2	1	4
Cagayan de Oro (10)	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Butuan (10)	0	7	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Sultan Kudarat (9)	0	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Davao (8)	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dipolog (9)	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Pagadian (9)	0	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Ipil (8)	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0

Camiguin (9)	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Misamis Oriental (11)	0	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1
Zamboanga City (7)	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bukidnon (9)	0	6	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0

Tool

The question that gathered the respondent's perception of successful reintegration was asked in three ways:

A. First form of the question: *What do you think are the factors that contribute to a successful reintegration of a trafficked child with his/her family or the community where he/she came from?*

There are two important elements in this question: 1) “What do you think”, which implies that there are no wrong or right answers, and which is supposed to make the respondent feel free, uninhibited, and secure in answering the question; and 2) “factors that contribute to a successful reintegration of a trafficked child...”, which is supposed to sound general and conceptual. This may be the most difficult of the three forms of the question because it is more abstract, but responses to this question are the potential source of categories in the tool to be constructed.

B. Second form of the question: *Do you know of any child who has been trafficked but was later reunited with his/her family? What were the needs of the child, which were or were not given? Write needs that were given on the left column of the paper and needs that were not given on the right column.*

There are four important elements in this question: 1) “Do you know of any child” makes the respondents think of a specific child and base their responses on that child, which makes this question easier to answer because the respondents are able to think in concrete terms, although their responses could be limited by the experiences of the child; 2) “later reunited with his/her family”, wherein the reuniting may or may not be good because it does not say “successfully reunited”; 3) “needs of the child that were given” to be written down on the left column of the questionnaire; and 4) “needs of the child that were not given” to be written down on the right column of the questionnaire. Needs that were and were not given are potential sources of positive and negative items in the instrument to be constructed.

C. Third form of the question: *Think of a child who has been successfully reunited with his/her family. Why do you say that the reunion is successful?*

There are three important elements in this question: 1) “Think of a child” means that the respondents have to think of a specific child and respond in concrete terms and base their

responses on the specific experiences of the child; 2) “successfully reunited with his/her family” means that the respondents have to further limit their thinking and focus only on those who have been successfully reunited. The process of judging that a reuniting was successful makes use of inductive thinking, wherein from specific observations, the respondent needs to come up with a generalization that this or that one is successful; 3) “Why do you say...” means that the respondents have to draw out the specific reasons for the judgment, which is a form of deductive thinking.

Because of the above concrete and abstract and deductive and inductive modes of thinking, we expect that we have covered all possible responses to be able to come up with a comprehensive set of indicators of successful reintegration from the point of view of the children, family, and community.

Each respondent in the survey was asked only one of the three forms of the question, to make it easier on them, and so that they could concentrate. Effort was exerted to make sure that the three question forms were answered equally among the various types of respondents in the 11 survey sites.

Data Gathering

After the three different forms of the questions were formulated, they were translated by professional translators into the three dialects spoken by the respondents. Two adults and two children native speakers of each of the three dialects were consulted as to the clarity of these questions, and revisions were made based on their comments.

The translations were back-translated into English by another translator for each dialect. Discrepancies were sorted out. The sampling for the three question forms was determined, with each subject answering only one form of the question. The interviewers were trained in the use of tape recorders and obtaining consent for using them, accurate, verbatim, and complete recording of the responses, and proper interaction with the respondents, as well as giving the respondents accurate and complete information on what the research was all about and then obtaining their consent to be part of the study.

The respondents’ responses were obtained in the local dialect and then translated into English by another translator for each dialect. The English translation was back-translated into the dialects by another translator for each dialect. Discrepancies were sorted out.

The interviewers conducted the interviews in the 11 designated areas, trying to equally distribute the number, type, and location of respondents among the three forms of the question, in order to make sure that all possible perceptions in the area were gathered. A sample form for obtaining consent to answer a form of the question can be found in **Appendix A**.

Data Analysis

The responses of the respondents were encoded. Researchers were trained in content-analysis. The encoded responses were content-analyzed in a workshop type of process, and a consensus was sought for each response.

The reintegration instrument was constructed based on the content-analyzed responses.

Field Testing

Field Testing Sites

The field testing to determine the reliability and validity of the draft instrument took place in other 11 areas of Mindanao, as follows (where the province is the same as in the survey site, other different districts were used): Cagayan de Oro, Camiguin Island, Davao, Ipil/Sibugay, Misamis Oriental, Saranggani Province, South Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat, Zamboanga City, Zamboanga del Norte, and Zamboanga del Sur.

Figure 2 shows the field testing sites in the island of Mindanao.

**Figure 2: Field testing sites in the island of Mindanao, Philippines
(White circles)**



Sampling

The second group of respondents consisted of 55 traffic survivors and 55 raters composed of relatives mostly mothers, social workers and friends, from other 11 areas of Mindanao. The 55 traffic survivors were below 18 when they were trafficked and below 25 at the time of the field testing during the latter part of 2009. They were recommended by organizations that have worked with them.

Table 2 shows the distribution of subjects for the field testing.

Table 2: Distribution of subjects for the field testing: survivors by gender and site; raters by site and relationship to survivor

Site	SURVI-VOR (55)		RATER (55)										
	M	F	MOTH-ER	Munic-ipal Soc.-Worke-r	FRIE-ND	SOCIA-L WORKE-R	BROTH-ER	Prov-in-cial Soc-Worker	FATHE-R	SIS-TER	AUN-T	GRAND-MOTHE-R	MOTHER-IN-LAW
CAGAYAN DE ORO	1	4	5										
CAMIGUIN ISLAND		5	5										
DAVAO		5	4		1								
IPIL/SIBUGAY		5	1			2	1	1					
MISAMIS ORIENTAL		5	5										
SARANGGANI	1	4	4						1				
SOUTH COTABATO		5	3							1	1		
SULTAN KUDARAT		5	3						1	1			
ZAMBOANGA CITY		5	3									1	1
ZAMBOANGA DEL NORTE		5		1		1		1			2		
ZAMBOANGA DEL SUR		5	4	1									
TOTAL FOR EACH COLUMN	2	53	37	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	1

Table 3 shows the frequency of survivors by age at the time of the field testing. They were trafficked at a younger age.

Table 3: Frequency of survivors by age at the time of the field testing

AGE	FREQUENCY
15	3
16	5
17	8
18	7
19	8
20	5
21	5
22	6
23	3
24	5
TOTAL	55

Tool

Based on the content-analyzed responses in the survey, the Reintegration Success Instrument was constructed for field testing. There is a version of the instrument for the survivor and another version for the rater. The survivor's version can be found in **Appendix B**, while the rater's version can be found in **Appendix C**.

Data Gathering

The instrument was field-tested with the second group of respondents in order to determine its reliability and validity.

The instrument was first translated into the three dialects spoken by the respondents by a translator for each dialect. It was back-translated into English by another group of translators. Discrepancies were sorted out, and the instrument was finalized for field testing.

Interviewers were trained in the use of tape recorders and obtaining consent for it, accurate, verbatim, and complete recording of the responses, and proper interaction with the respondents, as well as giving the respondents accurate and complete information on what the research was all about and obtaining their consent to be a respondent.

The interviewers went to the sites to conduct the interviews and recorded the respondents' responses in the local dialect. These were then translated into English by a translator for each dialect.

Data Analysis

The means and standard deviations of the respondents' scores were computed, in order to get a picture of the average and variability of their responses.

Reliability and Validity Study

Reliability refers to consistency of scores, while validity refers to whether the test measures what it purports to measure.

The purpose of the reliability and validity study was to determine if the instrument could adequately measure degree of success of reintegration. Reliability and validity testing included assessment of the following instrument characteristics:

1. Inter-rater reliability of the test as a whole
2. Inter-rater reliability per item
3. Content validity
4. Expert judgment validity
5. Criterion-related validity

Reliability

Inter-rater reliability of the test as a whole. Kappa coefficient, which is a statistical measure of inter-rater agreement for categorical items, was computed on the ratings of each pair of raters on all of the multiple choice items of the instrument, in order to obtain the degree of inter-rater agreement of raters on the test as a whole. The significance of the kappa coefficients was also tested.

Kappa measures the agreement between two raters who each classify N items into C mutually exclusive categories.

The equation for κ is:

$$\kappa = \frac{P(A) - P(E)}{1 - P(E)}$$

where $P(A)$ is the proportion of times that the two raters agree, and $P(E)$ is the proportion of times that we would expect the two raters to agree by chance. If the raters are in complete agreement then $\kappa = 1$. If there is no agreement among the raters other than what would be expected by chance, $\kappa = 0$ (Siegel and Castellan, Jr., 1988).

The significance of kappa was also tested using the formula:

$$z = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\kappa)}}$$

$$\text{where } \text{var}(\kappa) = \frac{P(E)}{N [1 - P(E)]}$$

Inter-rater reliability per item. Kappa coefficient and its test of significance were also computed on all pairs of raters' scores on each item in order to determine item reliability and which item should be retained or discarded.

Validity

Content Validity. Deriving the contents of the instrument from the perceptions of the relevant population grounded the contents of the instrument in the experience of the subjects.

Expert Judgment Validity. Content validity was further ascertained by subjecting the instrument to the scrutiny of an expert judge – a professor and master's degree holder of psychology and a Certified Clinical Psychologist, as well as a Certified Assessment Psychologist. The expert judge's brief resume can be found in **Appendix D**.

Criterion-Related Validity. Criterion-related validity was assessed by correlating the survivors' scores on the instrument with their answers to the question of whether they were generally satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, on a scale of 1 to 4, which served as the criterion, using Pearson correlation coefficient.

RESULTS

Survey Results

The survey of the respondents' perceptions of elements of successful reintegration yielded a few hundred responses, which were categorized into 62 categories. The 62 categories with some brief explanation or sample verbatim responses can be found in **Appendix E**. The categories were later further collapsed in formulating the instrument.

Field Testing Results

Fifty-five survivors and 55 raters were administered the instrument. Their mean score and standard deviation on each item of the instrument can be found in **Appendix F**. The average score of the survivors on the instrument is 70.47 ($SD=23.49$) out of a possible 144, which is 48.94%. Their overall item mean is 1.96 ($SD=.65$) out of a possible 4.0, which is between "Not at all" and "To a little extent", referring to the degree of reintegration assistance they were receiving.

Reliability

Inter-rater reliability of the test as a whole. Although 55 survivors and 55 raters were administered the instrument, only 40 pairs yielded complete data on all items and could be included in the analysis of inter-rater reliability of the test. Table 4 shows the kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on the entire test, their magnitude, and significance.

Table 4: Kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on the entire test, their magnitude, and significance

Pair	Pair no. in the sample with complete data	Survivor-rater Relations	κ	Magnitude *	Z value	Significance $\alpha=.001$ ($z=3.09$)
1	1	Son-mother	0.911	Almost Perfect	7.107	Signif.
2	3	Daughter-mother	1.0	Almost Perfect	6.207	Signif.
3	6	Daughter-mother	1.0	Almost Perfect	4.647	Signif.
4	9	Daughter-mother	1.0	Almost Perfect	5.835	Signif.
5	11	Daughter-mother	0.120	Slight	1.178	Not signif.
6	12	Daughter-mother	0.265	Fair	1.822	Not signif.
7	13	Survivor-friend	0.433	Moderate	3.840	Signif.
8	14	Daughter-mother	0.376	Fair	3.554	Signif.
9	15	Daughter-mother	0.618	Substantial	5.119	Signif.
10	16	Survivor-social worker	0.665	Substantial	4.695	Signif.
11	17	sister-brother	0.639	Substantial	3.552	Signif.
12	18	Survivor-social worker	0.572	Moderate	4.082	Signif.
13	19	Survivor-social worker	0.525	Moderate	3.324	Signif.
14	20	daughter-mother	0.678	Substantial	5.032	Signif.
15	21	daughter-mother	0.907	Almost Perfect	6.672	Signif.
16	22	daughter-	0.884	Almost Perfect		

		mother			5.110	Signif.
17	24	daughter-mother	0.953	Almost Perfect	6.960	Signif.
18	26	daughter-mother	0.198	Slight	1.425	Not signif.
19	27	son-father	0.170	Slight	1.707	Not signif.
20	28	daughter-mother	0.509	Moderate	4.449	Signif.
21	29	Daughter-mother	0.537	Moderate	5.187	Signif.
22	31	Daughter-mother	0.650	Substantial	6.201	Signif.
23	32	Daughter-mother	0.433	Moderate	4.341	Signif.
24	33	Sister-sister	0.542	Moderate	4.621	Signif.
25	34	Daughter-mother	0.676	Substantial	6.015	Signif.
26	35	Niece-aunt	0.617	Substantial	6.039	Signif.
27	36	Sister-sister	0.154	Slight	0.916	Not signif.
28	37	Daughter-mother	0.321	Fair	2.193	Not signif.
29	38	Daughter-mother	0.918	Almost Perfect	8.542	Signif.
30	41	Granddaughter-grandmother	0.397	Fair	3.110	Signif.
31	42	Daughter-mother	0.798	Substantial	4.298	Signif.
32	43	Daughter-mother	0.910	Almost Perfect	3.921	Signif.
33	48	Survivor-social worker	0.778	Substantial	3.870	Signif.
34	49	Survivor-social worker	0.385	Fair	1.161	Not signif.
35	50	Survivor-social worker	0.108	Slight	0.299	Not signif.
36	51	Daughter-mother	0.725	Substantial	5.764	Signif.
37	52	Daughter-mother	0.687	Substantial	5.657	Signif.
38	53	Daughter-mother	0.556	Moderate	4.049	Signif.
39	54	Survivor-social worker	0.491	Moderate	4.928	Signif.

40	55	Daughter-mother	0.587	Moderate	6.376	Signif.
		Mean	0.592	moderate		
		SD	0.259			

* Adapted from the classifications proposed by Landis and Koch (1977):

.11–.20	slight
.21–.40	fair
.41–.60	moderate
.61–.80	substantial
.81–1.00	almost perfect agreement

The mean is .59, which is moderate. The kappa coefficients range from “slight agreement” to “almost perfect agreement”. The coefficients of “almost perfect agreement” all come from mother-daughter and mother-son pairs, although some mother-daughter pairs and a father-son pair do not have almost perfect agreement.

Inter-rater reliability of each item. Table 5 presents the kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on each of the 36 multiple choice items of the instrument.

Table 5: Kappa coefficients of the 40 survivor-rater pairs on each of the 36 multiple choice items of the instrument

Item	ITEM NO. in the Instrument	K	Magnitude	z value	Significance $\alpha=.001$ ($z=3.09$)
1	1	0.555	Moderate	6.788	Signif.
2	3	0.387	Fair	4.324	Signif.
3	5	0.614	Substantial	7.191	Signif.
4	8	0.373	Fair	1.020	Not signif.
5	9	0.716	Substantial	5.627	Signif.
6	10	0.668	Substantial	4.498	Signif.
7	11	0.661	Substantial	8.242	Signif.
8	12	0.693	Substantial	8.561	Signif.
9	13	0.662	Substantial	8.301	Signif.
10	14	0.608	Substantial	5.240	Signif.
11	16	0.492	Moderate	2.647	Not signif.
12	17	0.692	Substantial	8.460	Signif.
13	18	0.695	Substantial	7.136	Signif.
14	19	0.462	Moderate	5.854	Signif.
15	20	0.527	Moderate	6.625	Signif.
16	21	0.516	Moderate	1.956	Not signif.

17	22	0.832	Almost Perfect	7.517	Signif.
18	23	0.364	Fair	4.217	Signif.
19	24	0.453	Moderate	5.548	Signif.
20	25	0.339	Fair	4.040	Signif.
21	26	0.629	Substantial	5.803	Signif.
22	27	0.505	Moderate	5.848	Signif.
23	28	0.577	Moderate	4.565	Signif.
24	29	0.649	Substantial	4.168	Signif.
25	30	0.475	Moderate	4.501	Signif.
26	31	0.767	Substantial	4.956	Signif.
27	32	0.724	Substantial	8.728	Signif.
28	33	0.685	Substantial	8.042	Signif.
29	34	0.799	Substantial	7.641	Signif.
30	35	0.690	Substantial	4.975	Signif.
31	36	0.498	Moderate	5.012	Signif.
32	37	0.540	Moderate	3.149	Signif.
33	38	0.618	Substantial	7.392	Signif.
34	39	0.534	Moderate	6.034	Signif.
35	40	0.801	Almost Perfect	7.744	Signif.
36	41	0.746	Substantial	5.465	Signif.
	Mean	0.599	Moderate		
	SD	0.130			

Kappa coefficients on all pairs of raters per item reveal a mean coefficient of $k = .599$, which is moderate. The coefficients range from “fair” to “almost perfect agreement”, with no coefficient lower than fair, meaning that the items are generally reliable.

It will be noted from the above that even though a κ value is higher than another, the former may be not significant, while the latter is. See, for example, item nos. 3, 16, 21, 23 and 25 above, wherein 16 and 21 are moderate but not significant, whereas 3, 23, and 25 are fair but significant. This is because $P(E)$ for 16 and 21 is already high. That is, the expected is high and it is easy to get agreement between the raters (Komagata, 2002). And therefore the resulting z value is small.

Validity

Content validity. Deriving the contents of the instrument from the perceptions of the relevant population grounded the items of the instrument in the experience of the subjects and provided initial validity to the instrument.

Expert judgment validity. Content validity was further ascertained by subjecting the instrument to the scrutiny of an expert judge – a professor and master's degree holder of psychology and a Certified Clinical Psychologist and Certified Assessment Psychologist.

The general comments of the expert follow:

“The self-report instruments are very comprehensive.

“To my mind, the areas mentioned in these instruments attempt to approximate and cover all the needed elements which have been perceived as the required variables to successful reintegration of sexually exploited girls.”

Criterion-related validity. Criterion-related validity was assessed by correlating the survivors' mean item scores with their answers to the question of whether they were generally satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, on a scale of 1 to 4, which served as the criterion, with 4 as most satisfied, using Pearson correlation coefficient.

Table 6 shows the mean item scores of the survivors and their response to the question.

Table 6: Survivors' mean item scores and response to question of whether they are generally satisfied with the reintegration assistance they were receiving, on a scale of 1 to 4 (4 being the most satisfied) which served as the criterion, using Pearson correlation coefficient

Survivor no.	Mean Item Score	Response to Question
1	2.1111	1
2	1.2777	1
3	1.5	1
4	1.3611	1
5	1.7222	2
6	1.25	1
7	1.3611	1
8	1.3611	1
9	1.4166	1
10	1.3611	1
11	2.6666	4
12	3.25	4
13	2.4722	3
14	2.4722	2
15	2.9444	4
16	1.5833	2

17	1.5277	2
18	1.9722	3
19	1.3611	2
20	2.0277	3
21	1.6388	1
22	1.5	1
23	1.6111	1
24	1.7222	1
25	1.3888	1
26	3.4444	4
27	2.6666	3
28	2.9722	4
29	2.7777	3
30	1.25	1
31	2.3611	4
32	2.5	4
33	2.4444	4
34	2.3888	4
35	2.25	4
36	3.5	2
37	3.3888	4
38	2.2777	2
39	1.7777	2
40	1.25	1
41	2.0833	3
42	1.5833	2
43	1.2777	1
44	1.6111	2
45	2.25	4
46	1.5	1
47	1.4444	2
48	1.3611	1
49	1.1111	1
50	1.0833	1
51	1.9166	2
52	1.7222	2
53	1.6388	2
54	2.6388	3
55	2.3333	3

The Pearson correlation coefficient obtained is $r = .81$ ($df = 54$, $z = 5.96$, significant at $< .001$), indicating high criterion-related validity.

DISCUSSION

Survey Results

The survey results reveal the specific voices behind general declarations that, for example, reintegrated girls need settlement in a stable and safe environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal, social and economic development and access to social and emotional support, etc.

While many of the expressed needs in the survey are known to be common human needs, some needs like the need for justice, the need to be asked first if they wanted to immediately be reintegrated with their families, the need to be brought to church, or the need to be understood and not ridiculed make us understand better the other needs that are peculiar to children who have been severely traumatized by other people.

The survey responses also gave specific ideas on what it means, for example, for the child to be empowered, and that is, she is not afraid to face her recruiter or her perpetrator and she will no longer be influenced by them. The respondents gave us specific ideas what freedom and security means, and that is, being able to sleep and wake up anytime they want, gaining back the security of being loved by loved ones, peace of mind that they will not experience “those difficulties” again, getting rid of the fear of being far from their families again, or relief that they will not be afraid of having customers anymore, which normal people just take for granted.

Many of the responses concern tangibles and observables, such as, food, medicines and hospitalization, schooling, livelihood, housing, reuniting with family, etc. Many of the responses also focus on intangibles, such as acceptance, respect, love, personality development, values development of both the child and the family, peace of mind, etc. Those giving reintegration assistance need to bear all of the intangibles in mind, as well.

Field Testing Results

The results of the field testing reveal that the survivors generally do not perceive their reintegration to be very successful. The mean item score of 1.96 means that the reintegration assistance given ranges from “Not at all” given to given “To a little extent”. Given the demonstrated reliability and validity of the instrument that measured their perceptions, we can say that the results reflect the true state of their perception. There is a need to improve reintegration assistance given to reintegrated girls in Mindanao.

The following is the philosophy of reintegration that could be derived from the results of the study.

A Philosophy

Love146 Philosophy of Reintegration

Introduction

A safe home is where we nurse the bird's broken wing. If we do well with our nursing, then the bird should be able to fly again and out of the safe home, and soar to the heights it was meant to reach. If it casts a glance at the safe home again, then it should be from above, among the clouds of its achievements.

It is in the world outside that the bird can try out its mended wing.

Reintegration is integral to the normal development of the child because it is in the context of the greater society that self-worth (how the child views herself as a result of how others treat her) is formed and can be reformed. It is society that provides an audience to one's performance and release of potentials. It is society that fulfills the human being's nature as a social being and instinctive longing to participate in the social world.

Aftercare in the safe home is equipping the child with a fighting chance to achieve a high self-worth among others in society. Aftercare in the safe home develops the child's potentials and encourages the child to become what the child can become. Aftercare nurses wounds with antidotes in order to heal the child and make her strong for her onward flight in the outside world: where there was brutality, there is now love and gentleness; where there was deprivation, there is now adequate provision; where there was hopelessness, hope is now provided at every interaction; where there was disorder and confusion, there is now discipline; where there was lack of dignity, there is now respect; where there was weakness and lack of voice, there is now strength and self-assertion, in order to prevent that which wounded the child in the first place.

All of the above are in preparation for the child's being a viable part of society once again.

Thus, aftercare in the safe home is implemented with a view to reintegration. Aftercare in the safe home is not the end of the recovery road. Reintegration that is satisfactory to the child and in the best interest of the child is the final destination of the work of aftercare.

Thus, aftercare has two stages and both of these two stages must be implemented if aftercare is to be complete: the safe home stage and the reintegration stage. The safe home stage may overlap with some aspects of the reintegration stage in order to provide a gradual transition from one stage to the other.

The philosophy of aftercare in the safe home (Round Home) has been discussed in another paper. This paper focuses on the philosophy of the other stage of aftercare, which is reintegration.

Vision

The children are again part of the greater society, this time as productive, empowered, and fully functioning individuals, in the process of becoming what they can become, and protected from re-experiencing abuse, exploitation, or trafficking.

Mission

The aftercare program of Love146 is committed to facilitating ways and means to promote the children's productiveness, empowerment, full functioning, realization of their potentials, and protected from re-experiencing abuse, exploitation, or trafficking.

Goals/Objectives/Activities to Meet the Objectives

Goals	Objectives	Activities
1. To promote the children's productiveness and economic viability in society	1.1 To continue to help secure training or education for the child that will eventually enable the child to land a decent job 1.2 To help, where possible, in the child's or family's job placement 1.3 To facilitate small-scale entrepreneurship, where possible	—exploration and pinpointing of training opportunities and institution in the community that are appropriate for the child —where appropriate, facilitating the entry of the child into such institution —where appropriate, facilitating the child's or family's entry into a suitable job —providing seed money for the child's or family's small-scale entrepreneurship
2. To ensure the children's empowerment in society	2.1 To continue to make the child aware of their rights and how to assert them 2.2 To inform the child of	—counseling with the child regarding her rights and engaging her in exercise on self-assertion —keeping the child abreast

	<p>available resources in the community and how to tap them</p> <p>2.3 To link the child up with available resources</p>	<p>of information on available resources in the community and giving her clear and detailed directions on how to tap them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> —speaking to government and other agencies on behalf of the child —facilitating a process wherein the child gets available help open to all citizens
3. To facilitate the children's full functioning in society	<p>3.1 To make the child aware of their different roles in society and the significant contribution such roles could make for the improvement of society</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —continuous counseling on the child's different roles in the community, i.e., being a daughter, sister, friend, student, etc., and how they could be played for the child's satisfaction and self-worth, and for the improvement of society —values clarification
4. To help the children realize their potentials	<p>4.1 To encourage the child to pursue talents and interests</p> <p>4.2 To explore ways by which the child could actualize their potentials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —continuous counseling and assessment of the child's aptitudes, values, and interests —career counseling to match child's direction in life with her aptitudes, values, and interests —looking for venues for, and facilitating the child's expression of talent in singing, arts, gardening, acting, etc.
5. To protect the children from re-experiencing abuse, exploitation, or trafficking	<p>5.1 To keep the child informed of the dynamics of abuse and exploitation</p> <p>5.2 To keep the child informed of all sources of help</p> <p>5.3 To make the child aware of her strengths that will</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —counseling —continuing education about the problem —dialogues with community members and officials regarding protection of children in the community

	enable her to protect herself 5.4 To mobilize the community toward protection of children in the community 5.5 To help sort out family situations that could make children susceptible to being exploited again	—family counseling
6. To ensure the children's physical well-being	6.1 To assist with the child's and family's nutritional and medical needs	—assistance in providing food and medicines and needed hospitalization and/or linking them up with agencies that can do so —continuous family counseling —assistance in finding suitable accommodations
7. To promote the children's mental health and emotional well-being	7.1 To provide a forum where emotional problems are dealt with and mental issues are discussed and resolved	—individual counseling —family counseling —dialogues with other concerned individuals and groups
8. To uphold justice for the children	8.1 To assist the child in the activities that are necessary in her/his quest for justice	—assistance with all legal matters and concomitant costs (accompanying the child to court hearings, rehearsals) —emotional support and encouragement

Evaluation

Context evaluation is done before reintegration of each child in order to determine whether the context is valid for such reintegration. All concerned, including the child, family, community, relevant partner agencies and safe home staff, are the subject of evaluation.

Process evaluation is done every six months and is based on the objectives and planned activities.

Outcome evaluation is done every year and is based on the goals.

A CASE STUDY

Amanda (not her real name), the sixth in a brood of seven, narrated to the Aftercare director, with the help of some drawings, the story of how she came to be trafficked. She was an ordinary third-year high school student in the province when her crisis began. Money had become tight in her family, and she was asked by her parents to stop schooling for a while. At that time, she was already preparing to enter fourth-year high school.

Then a woman came to their house and said Amanda could work as a salesgirl in a big department store in Manila. The woman had recruited other girls from her town, so her parents agreed.

Upon arriving in Manila, instead of taking them to a department store, the woman took them to a bar, and they never saw the woman again. The bar turned out to be a front for a prostitution business. Amanda was forcibly kept there for four months.

She said that at the brothel, she was not given money or allowed to go out. She found out that in her group, no two girls from the same province or town were grouped together, in order to prevent connivance to escape.

She said that after one month in the brothel, she managed to get hold of a cell phone and relayed a message to her family. Then her father and brother came to Manila to look for her. They already inquired at the bar, but they were told that she was not there. Learning about this later, she wept at the thought that she could have seen her family and gone away with them at that time.

The bar was later raided by the police. News of the raid was on television and all over the newspapers. She was one of dozens of girls who were rescued.

She was brought first to a military camp, then to a safe home in the south, then to another safe home in Manila, and finally to the Love146 safe home, called the Round Home.

Love146 gave her holistic aftercare, including sending her to school for 15 months, among others. Afterwards she was ready to be reunited with her family.

When we took her home, we also made an assessment of her needs, and what needs her family would be capable or incapable of meeting. We formulated a program of reintegration on how we could provide for the gaps.

We continued to send her to school and provided an allowance that would enable her to go to school regularly and secure her school needs. We provided for her medical expenses. We assisted with her court proceedings, accompanying her to court hearings when necessary, rehearsing her testimony with her, and providing encouragement so that she would stand firm on her story. We also involved her and her family in making handicrafts, from which they earned some money. When she fell in love and wanted to

get married, we provided the necessary counseling and helped out with wedding expenses. We continue to send her to school and monitor her situation. We provided a tricab—a three-wheeled cheap means of public transport—which her husband uses in selling fruits and vegetables, for which Love146 also provided the seed money. His small business now provides for their daily needs.

After one year of interventions, Amanda and her mother were also administered the constructed reintegration instrument. She scored 124 out of 144 on the instrument, which is 86.11%, compared to the 48.94% of the field testing group. Her mean item score is 3.44 out of a possible 4.0, which is between “To a moderate extent” and “To a very great extent”, compared to 1.96 of the field testing group. Her and her mother’s scores yielded a kappa coefficient of 0.755102 ($z=3.253817$) which is significant at .001. Given the demonstrated reliability and validity of the instrument, there is reason to have confidence that the results reflect reality to a reasonable degree.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey has yielded comprehensive, empirical data on elements of successful reintegration from the voices of the affected populations themselves.

The instrument that was derived from the survey results demonstrated adequate validity and reliability and can be used to measure success of reintegration of traffic survivors in other parts of the Philippines.

The field-testing sample reported that their reintegration leaves many unmet needs. A program of reintegration can be derived from the expressed and unmet needs of a reintegrated population.

The girl in the case study in this report, as well as her adult rater, gave favorable feedback on the reintegration interventions provided her. Such interventions can be replicated with other reintegrated survivors.

It is recommended that the instrument be used both as one of the evaluation tools and as a guide by NGOs as well as government agencies working toward the reintegration of their clients and wanting to determine whether their efforts have been effective, from the perspective of the affected populations. The instrument could also be refined further. Alternatively, NGOs wanting to evaluate their reintegration efforts can also derive their evaluation tool from the actual situation and experiences of the people who will respond to the evaluation measure.

REFERENCES

Jobe, A.

- 2010 *The causes and consequences of re-trafficking: Evidence from the IOM human trafficking database*. International Organization for Migration, Geneva. Available at:
http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/causes_of_retrafficking.pdf

Komagata, N.

- 2002 Chance agreement and the significance of the Kappa Statistic. Department of Computer Science, The College of New Jersey. Draft.pdf. Available at:
<http://nobo.komagata.net/pub/Komagata02-Kappa.pdf>

Landis, J.R. & G.G. Koch

- 1977 "The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data". *Biometrics* 33 (1): 159–174.

Lisborg, A.

- 2009 *Re-thinking reintegration (What do returning victims really want and need? Evidence from Thailand and the Philippines*. Strategic Information Response Network, United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP): Phase III. Available at:
http://www.no-trafficking.org/reports_docs/siren/GMS-07_rethinking_reintegration.pdf

Siegel, S. & N.J. Castellan, Jr.

- 1988 *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Surtees, R.

- 2010 *Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. A manual*. Nexus Institute, Washington; King Baudouin Foundation, Brussels. Available at:
<http://www.emnbelgium.be/sites/default/files/publications/pub-2051-frb-reintegration.pdf>

APPENDIX A

OBTAINING CONSENT TO ANSWER THE SURVEY QUESTION, REINTEGRATION STUDY (sample form)

Hello, my name is _____. We are conducting a survey to give us ideas on how some programs could be improved. Would you agree to answer a question and have your answer recorded on tape? Your name and other details about you will not be recorded or reported. But your answers could contribute to some people's planning of programs.

If subject agrees, proceed to question.

Question: What do you think are the factors that contribute to a successful reintegration of a trafficked child with his/her family or the community where he/she came from?

APPENDIX B

S

Reintegration Success Instrument

(To be stated by the interviewer to the respondent/survivor)

Hi, I am _____. We are conducting a study on people who have been returned to their community. Your responses could help us to understand them and their needs. Your answers will be kept in confidence. Would you have a few minutes to answer some questions? (If yes, proceed)
Would you like your name to be written on this paper of your responses?
Could I have your permission to tape your responses? Your responses will not be identified with you and will be kept confidential.

1. Name of respondent (optional) _____ 2. Gender _____

3. Date of Birth _____

4. Address

5. Occupation

Directions: The following are questions that pertain to your experiences.

Please tick or supply the answer that corresponds to what you know or how you honestly feel. Your honest answers could contribute to improving assistance to girls like you. Thank you very much for your time.

1. Were you given counseling after you were reintegrated?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

2. If so, by whom? _____

3. Were your parents/family/guardians given counseling?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

4. If so, by whom? _____

5. If counseling was given, did it help you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

6. If counseling helped you, in what way?

7. If counseling did not help you, what made you say so?

8. Were you provided a source of livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

9. Were there efforts to go after your recruiter/pimp?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

10. Was legal assistance given to you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

11. Are you being protected from being abused/exploited/trafficked again?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

12. Are you being protected from bad peer influence?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

13. Were you accepted positively by the community and not teased or ostracized?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

14. Were you given spiritual guidance?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

15. If so, in what way?

16. Were the neighbors prepared by NGOs or GOs for your arrival?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

17. Were you housed and helped in a temporary shelter before you were reunited with your family/carers?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

18. Were you asked if you wanted to be reunited with your family/carers?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

19. Are you happy with your life at present?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

20. Do you think that you are now able to protect yourself?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

21. Has your family been given a source of livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

22. Can your family meet your daily needs?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

23. Do you have friends and relatives who support you emotionally?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

24. Do you think that you have improved as a person after you have been reintegrated?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

25. Are you more aware now of what is good for your well-being and safety?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

26. Has your community been taught about trafficking and how to protect children from it?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

27. Are your parents/guardians/carers supportive of your welfare?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

28. Do you get assistance for your medical problems?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

29. Has assistance been given to other members of your family in terms of where it is needed, for example, for medical needs, legal issues, etc.?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

30. Have you been referred to agencies that can help you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

31. Are you doing any vocational, academic, social or livelihood activity that keeps you busy?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

32. Do you receive encouragement/coaching to stand up for your rights and reject potential traffickers or pimps?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

33. Do you have peace of mind and sense of freedom from the perpetrators?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

34. Do the local government officials support you in one way or another?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

35. Are you able to pursue your ambition in life?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

36. Does your family accept you despite what happened to you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

37. Are you being taught skills to be able to pursue a livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

38. Are you happy to be reunited with your family?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

39. Are your parents/guardians being good parents to you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

40. Are the police supportive of you?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

41. Are you being visited and followed up by an NGO or GO?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

42. Are you going to school?

Yes No

THANK YOU

APPENDIX C

R

Reintegration Success Instrument

(To be stated by the interviewer to the respondent)

Hi, I am _____. We are conducting a study on people who have been returned to their community. Your responses could help us to understand them and their needs. Your answers will be kept in confidence. Would you have a few minutes to answer some questions? (If yes, proceed)

Would you like your name to be written on this paper of your responses?

Could I have your permission to tape your responses? Your responses will not be identified with you and will be kept confidential.

1. Name of respondent (optional) _____ 2. Gender _____

3. Date of Birth _____

4. Address _____

5. Occupation _____

6. Relationship to reintegrated girl/boy_____

**7. Initials of reintegrated girl/boy_____ 8. Reintegrated Child's Date
of Birth _____**

Directions: The following are questions that pertain to the situation of

**_____.
(Name or initials of survivor)**

Please tick or supply the answer that corresponds to what you know or how you honestly feel. Your honest answers will contribute to improving assistance to girls/boys like her/him. Thank you very much for your time.

A. Were you around at the time when the girl/boy was reintegrated with her/his family/community? _____ Yes _____ No

If Yes, please proceed to the questions below. If No, you do not have to respond to this questionnaire.

1. Was the girl/boy given counseling after she/he was reintegrated?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

2. If so, by whom? _____

3. Were the parents/family/guardians given counseling?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

4. If so, by whom? _____

5. If counseling was given, did it help the girl/boy?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

6. If counseling helped, in what way?

7. If counseling did not help, what made you say so?

8. Was the girl/boy provided a source of livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

9. Were there efforts to go after the recruiter/pimp?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

10. Was legal assistance given to the girl/boy?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

11. Is the girl/boy being protected from being abused/exploited/trafficked again?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

	extent		
--	---------------	--	--

12. Is the girl/boy being protected from bad peer influence?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

13. Was the girl/boy accepted positively by the community and not teased or ostracized?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

14. Was the girl/boy given spiritual guidance?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

15. If so, in what way?

16. Were the neighbors prepared by NGOs or GOs for the girl's/boy's arrival?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

17. Was the girl/boy housed and helped in a temporary shelter before she/he was reunited with her/his family/carers?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

18. Was the girl/boy consulted if she/he wanted to be reunited with her/his family/carers?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

19. Does she/he seem happy about her/his life at present?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

20. Does the girl/boy now show ability to protect herself/himself?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

21. Was the girl's/boy's family given a source of livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

22. Can the family meet their daily needs?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

23. Does the girl/boy have friends and relatives who support her/him emotionally?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

24. Has the girl/boy shown improvement in her/his personality after the reintegration??

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

25. Is the girl/boy now more aware of what is good for her/his well-being and safety?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

26. Has the girl's/boy's community been educated about trafficking and how to protect children from it?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

27. Are the parents/guardians/carers supportive of the child's welfare?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

28. Does the child get assistance for her/his medical problems?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

29. Has assistance been given to other family members in terms of where it is needed, for example, for medical needs, legal issues, etc.?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

30. Has the girl/boy been referred to agencies that can help her/him?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

31. Is the girl/boy doing any vocational, academic, social or livelihood activity that keeps her/him busy?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

32. Is the girl/boy being encouraged/coached to stand up for her/his rights and reject potential traffickers or pimps?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

33. Does the girl/boy manifest peace of mind and sense of freedom from the perpetrators?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

34. Do the local government officials support the girl/boy in one way or another?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

35. Is the girl/boy pursuing her/his ambition in life?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

36. Does the family accept the girl/boy despite what happened to her/him?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

37. Is the girl/boy being taught skills to be able to pursue a livelihood?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

38. Is the girl/boy happy to be reunited with her/his family?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

39. Are the girl's parents/guardians showing good parenting?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

	extent		
--	---------------	--	--

40. Are the police supportive of the girl/boy?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

41. Is the girl/boy being visited and followed up by an NGO or GO?

To a very great extent	To a moderate extent	To a little extent	Not at all
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------

42. Is the girl/boy going to school?

_____ Yes _____ No

THANK YOU

APPENDIX D

BRIEF RESUME OF PROF. ANTERO V. ARIAS, JR.

Prof. Antero Rosauro V. Arias, Jr., MS, has recently been recognized as a **Certified Clinical Psychologist** (CCLP) by the Psychological Association of the Philippines (PAP), the projected accredited professional organization (APO) of the psychology board under the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in preparation for the implementing rules and guidelines of Republic Act (RA) No. 10029 (the law that professionalized the discipline of psychology). He has also been recognized as a **Certified Assessment Psychologist** (CASP) by the PAP. In addition, he is a **Registered Guidance Counselor** (RGC) under R.A. No. 9258, the law that professionalized counseling.

He is also an international affiliate of the American Psychological Association (APA), an associate member of the Psychological Association of the Philippines (PAP) and the Philippine Guidance and Counseling Association (PGCA), and a regular member of the Philippine Mental Health Association (PMHA).

With a rank of full professor (Professor 6), he formerly acted as the Subject Chair/Program Coordinator of the Psychology Department of the Mapua Institute of Technology (MIT), Intramuros, Manila. He is now the cluster head of the A.B. Psychology Program of said institution.

Pursuing his doctorate degree in psychology, Prof. Arias finished the degree in Master of Science in Psychology at the De La Salle University, Manila, in 1998, and two other undergraduate social science courses.

APPENDIX E

CATEGORIES OF PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION

(With brief explanations and some sample verbatim responses)

(Note: Some explanations about the categories are made just to clarify what the category is all about. Sometimes, examples of responses are given.)

1. COUNSELING & PSYCHOTHERAPY

- To be able to forget, to forgive, to not fear people, to get over the shock, to cope, to self-manage, to accept, to get rid of the shame, to rebuild self-esteem, to learn to trust again, to be strong against ridicule by other people, to get rid of addiction

2. EMPLOYMENT

- For the child and for her family

3. JUSTICE

- Apprehend recruiter and pimp, legal assistance, freedom to file a case

4. NOT TO BE/BEING ABUSED AND EXPLOITED AGAIN

5. ASSURANCE – FUTURE

6. FREEDOM FROM BAD PEERS' / FRIENDS' INFLUENCE

7. COMMUNITY SUPPORT / ACCEPTANCE

- Not to be ridiculed, judged, and maltreated by people in the village, to be respected, to be understood

8. SPIRITUAL COUNSELING

- to be taught how to pray, to be brought to church

9. PREPARATION OF THE COMMUNITY

- Educate the community and family about victims of human trafficking so they know what to do when child arrives

10. CENTER / SHELTER first before reintegrating with family

- For assessment, counseling

11. MANIFESTATION OF HAPPINESS

- If they look happy, then most likely their reintegration is successful

12. IMMEDIATE RESCUE

- She recovered because she was rescued immediately

13. BETTER SELF-AWARENESS

- I am now obedient
- And I now understand that I am not supposed to do it again
- I am more responsible with myself now
- I still want to go to work but not anymore as a waitress, to be a domestic helper just so I will have a salary and to buy what I want to eat
- I am now aware of what is bad (wrong) about trafficking
- The trafficked child should be well-informed and empowered about (the issues of) trafficking so that she can protect herself
- Since she already experienced a difficult life, she cannot be deceived immediately by strangers anymore
- Make sure that somebody knows her employer well

14. FAMILY VALUES

- My mom was the one who encouraged me to work as a prostitute at the age of six because she had 3 men (lovers)

15. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

16. SUPPORT SYSTEM

- The sympathy of my friends and neighbors because they know that I am a good child really
- Because many (people) helped me
- Successful, because despite the many problems encountered, I'm able to overcome them because of the people who are helping me
- I will never forget all the people who helped me
- The staff here in Tambayan helped her so she could go back home
- Her neighbor who knew her took her away from the bar
- She got help from family and relatives aside from help of other people
- She was taken by her acquaintance who helped her go home
- She was afraid and crying when she was taken away from her parents because nobody could help her

17. PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

- Her in-laws taught her so she would not be disrespected by other people, for example, on the way she dresses up, on interacting with friends, etc.
- Now, I'm good in helping other people since I was sent here and assisted by CIU to recover
- She is already obedient
- I'm more enthusiastic about my future
- I'm not like I used to be
- Life skills weekly
- Empowering her again as a human person
- But now I'm already mature
- Communication and interpersonal skills

18. VALUES FORMATION

- I will not go back to Malaysia to work as a sex worker
- Teaching the child with good values
- My innocence has brought me to different groups
- She now knows that it is not good not to obey her parents
- Another thing is that the child now listens to the advice of the parents
- And I already know what is right or wrong

- I can already control my fooling around, because my priority is the future of my family especially my child
- I now have direction, to see what is good for my family
- I'm no longer afraid if somebody would recruit me because I know what to tell them now that I have awareness on trafficking
- For her not to think of going back to her previous life as a trafficked child for the reason that she likes it more than her life with her family

19. SURVIVAL

- I'm successful because I continue to live

20. AWARENESS & EMPOWERMENT OF COMMUNITY

- By being an empowered community on (the issues of) trafficking, the community becomes knowledgeable on how to protect the children from being trafficked
- Awareness of how to reduce the number of children being trafficked

21. CONSENT OF THE CHILD TO BE REUNITED

- Prior to sending back the child to his/her family, it is important to ask her/him if she/he agrees to be reunited with her/his family
- Not to be forced if she does not want to go back to her family
- She may then be reunited only when she is ready

22. FAR FROM THE SOURCE OF THE PROBLEM

- Far from the problems of my parents

23. MEDIA EXPOSURE

24. SUPPORT IN PREGNANCY

25. FULL SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY

- Guidance from the family
- First, the child needs the full support of the family
- The parents should look into the child's needs and make sure that the needs are being met
- I can say that her return is good because she is being supported by her father
- The reunion of the trafficked child with her family is successful because she has gained back the trust of her mother

- The family is supporting her in all of her needs

26. SUBSTITUTE FAMILY

- She wanted to live with a family who would treat her as real family
- It seems that she did not find it from her mother and father
- She wanted to look for it, perhaps from another family

27. HELP FOR OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY

- Help for the mother who is imprisoned

28. FAMILY COUNSELING

- Counseling the child and parents

29. AGENCY SUPPORT

- I think she was not provided with any service because she went home without going through any agency
- It was only her friend who took her home
- Service in going back home
- Not assisted by any agency

30. REFERRAL

- Referral to appropriate people who can help her

31. PREPARATION FOR REINTEGRATION

- Preparation for reintegration at the center; the center should have holistic preparation for reintegration
- Value reintegration activities while in the center.

32. PREOCCUPATION

- Boring to stay home because there is nothing to do.
- Nothing to be busy with
- Sometimes, helping in the restaurant where she was working before had helped her a lot

- She stays at home and just helps in taking care of her nephew/niece; could be trafficked again
- She is better now because she is now busy.

33. HELP OTHERS

- And I'm happy that I am able to help children who went through the same experience like mine.

34. PLACE TO STAY

- She stayed with us when we came back here. She stayed with us because she had nowhere to stay.

35. EMPOWERMENT OF THE CHILD

- In the emotional aspect, that she is not afraid to face her recruiter or her perpetrator.
- And that she/he will not be influenced by them

36. FREEDOM / SECURITY

- Here we can sleep and wake up anytime we want, not like when I was still with the group; it was very difficult
- They are now contented with what they have rather than let her work anywhere; something bad might happen to the child
- Because she has gained her freedom back from the hands of bad people/employer
- She is no longer a prisoner
- She has gained back the security of being loved by her loved ones
- What is important is peace of mind and that she will not experience those difficulties again
- And she gained her freedom back, in her mind
- Getting rid of the fear that they will be far from their family again
- Her return to her family was a great relief because she will not be afraid anymore that there will be customers and “Mama-sans” who will abuse her

37. PROTECTION

- They have to bring and fetch the child from school to make sure that the child does not go anywhere else
- No evident protection
- Protection from the recruiter
- Far from danger
- Child protection is no longer sustained
- For the parents themselves to give the child protection
- As for me, the reunion would have been successful if they protected me when I came back here
- For the community to give protection to the child and family
- The community itself should protect the child from the threats of the recruiter to the child and her/his family
- Security from the parents if they would take care of her, and she would not be trafficked again
- The village officials should ensure that the child and her family are protected and provided for
- No protection since friends are just around to entice her again
- Protection from the trafficker because she can still see her/him
- Far from the place she used to work in and from her recruiter
- Protection

38. NOT REUNITE IMMEDIATELY

- Because it is hard for one who is trafficked to be instantly reunited with her/his family
- Not reunite the child with her family right away
- Send her back to her family only when she is ready

39. GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

- And it is always very necessary to have support from the government
- And the community to look after the welfare of the children
- Where the government takes big responsibility for programs for the children
- For the concerned agency to come up with a solution to find and return the trafficked child
- With appropriate services from the government and NGOs
- Support from the government and NGOs
- Services from the government
- No financial support from the government

40. LONG-TIME FULFILLMENT OF DREAMS

- The return of the child like me will be successful if the child could already reach her dreams in life
- That I would be happy by the time I get married and for my children to be happy
- I want to become a Marine
- The child should set a plan/goal to fulfill her dreams, like, to study
- It seems that she is getting married soon to one of our friends who works as a security guard; that will be her dream come true
- And besides she is married now; she has fulfilled her dream
- And her husband has helped her a lot to realize her dream
- To have a new life

41. PARENTS' LIVELIHOOD

42. DID NOT GO AWAY AGAIN

- He did not go away again.
- Since then, she did not go back to Samal to be a prostitute.
- She did not stow away again and believed the people who tried to bring her to Manila.
- Yes, there were two of them but the other one ran away again
- Now she is with her sister and she does not go fooling around anymore

43. HOME

- Most especially a home where the child could stay with her mother because they were merely squatters

44. FAMILY ACCEPTANCE / RESPECT / LOVE FOR THE CHILD

- Her parents accepted her
- Accepted by parents
- She was accepted by her parents, brothers and sisters and most all her boyfriend
- Yes, because she was accepted by her family even though she left without permission
- Yes, my friend is successful because she was accepted by her family and boyfriend
- The family's acceptance of the child when she returned
- Her family accepted her
- I was not blamed by my siblings for what had happened to me

- Good because the parents themselves pursued the search for her.
- Not to humiliate her in front of other people
- Respect and love for the child by parents and other family members
- We can say that the child has successfully returned to her family and community because of the acceptance of the parents and companions at home of what had happened to her life
- She was accepted by her parents, brothers and sisters

45. AWARENESS OF THE ISSUE

- Better understand the law of recruitment and trafficking
- She is already knowledgeable about trafficking
- And she would no longer be gullible to go with somebody she doesn't know and she would be able to help children who intend to leave

46. SKILLS / LIFE TRAINING

- Will go back to her family with comprehensive skills training on cosmetology
- Skills training or income generating projects for the parents.
- To provide them with skills training, so they would learn how to make a decent living
- Or to do something like skills enhancement for her to get busy for self-fulfillment.
- Training on sewing and cooking
- Skills training
- Non-formal skills training
- Skills training for the child

47. REUNITE WITH THE FAMILY

- Living together with her parents again
- I was able to go back home to my parents
- Back to the family
- What is important is that our family is together again
- With my family especially with my child now, I'm no longer in pain when I think of my past
- After going back to my family
- I am no longer afraid of people with bad intentions because I am back in my place and with my family
- A child's reintegration is successful if she returns back to her family
- The most important thing of all is that the child is reunited with his/her family

- It would have been much better to have the family complete
- For the child, she doesn't care if there is constant suffering because of being poor, as long she is back with her family
- I really miss my family because I cannot call them on the phone
- Now I am with them again
- I am now contented to simply take care of my family
- Being with love of her life, who are his/her siblings and parents.
- I'm just happy that I'm reunited with my family; I did not have any idea that my work would be like that
- She is not going to separate from her family again
- Being together with my family especially with my child
- It is successful if we see our child at home with us
- I know of a child who was trafficked who went back to her place and was reunited with her family. That was successful
- Just taking her back to her family
- Successful because she is back with her family even if she is not able to go back to school
- I can say it is successful because she is here with us again

48. NOT TO BE INFLUENCED BY PEOPLE

- And for her not to be persuaded again by people who convince her to work there again.

49. FOOD – SUSTENANCE

- And we can eat.
- It is important that we can eat
- Maybe one thing that we must consider is to provide them with their basic needs, because most of them are usually trafficked because of poverty
- And food assistance
- Food

50. CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS

- Capital to engage in business
- My parents were given a small capital to sell foodstuff
- When she came back she started with a small business.

51. WISHES

- Granted their wishes

52. REFORM OF FAMILY MEMBERS

- I left home that time and worked in a brothel because I hated my father; he was often drunk and would physically hurt me most of the time. I wasn't supposed to come back here if not for my father's promise that he would change.

53. GOOD VALUES

- And to teach her good values.

54. FARE / TRANSPORTATION

- Her fare in going back home is free
- Fare to go back home
- Bringing them and spending for their fare
- Transportation
- Fare to go back home, that's all
- Ticket to return home
- Fare for those who need to go back to their province

55. COMMUNITY OFFICIALS

- The officers of the village where the child came from should give ongoing support so that the child will no longer think of leaving again
- One is to inform the village officials on laws on trafficking
- And for the village officials not to be affected by the threats and money of the traffickers

56. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- To always get involved with the activities in the community
- The community support is good

57. PARENTING

- There is also a need for the parents to know how to raise their children in properly

- The parents must take responsibility for their child.
- Guidance by parents
- The love and care of the parents are needed
- Care from the parents
- Attention of the parents because she has always been neglected
- The child lacks attention from the mother
- Counseling the mother because she was the reason why the child left, because the child was neglected.
- Was not provided attention by the parents

58. LAW – ENFORCERS

- But we are now fine because we are no longer afraid that the police will run after us and we have to hide
- It is difficult to keep on hiding from the police; we no longer have to do that because they now protect us

59. STOPPING PARENTS FROM FORCING THEIR CHILDREN TO WORK

- Sometimes the parents themselves want their children to work back at the bar because of extreme poverty
- Especially for the child, because there is a tendency for the child to look for a way to work and help her family

60. BASIC SERVICES

- Clothing
- Food
- Aftercare services
- Other basic needs such as education
- The first most important things for reintegration of a trafficked child to be successful is the provision of support services such as livelihood assistance, scholarship grant, health care, financial assistance and food assistance.
- Basic services
- Now I can eat properly unlike before I hardly had food to eat
- On services, hasten services so as to prioritize the trafficked child and her family in her own community by providing immediate services like; health, basic food.
- Temporary shelter

- My daughter was not provided with proper medical treatment
- No services have been provided to the child
- Was not brought to see a Doctor, because they do not have money, she is ill with U.T.I.
- When she got back to our place she was so sick and pale but then her mom did not have money for her treatment so she was sick a few days.

61. SCHOOLING

- Money, to continue schooling.
- But I cannot say that it is successful because she has not gone back to school
- By sending me to school, in third year high school.
- Education, so she would not be persuaded to work in that place again
- Successful because she is presently attending school as a working student
- Scholarship
- Support for school is also very important for me because I want to finish my studies, but we are poor, that is why I decided to leave to look for money so that I can go to school but I ended up working in a bar, which I didn't like

62. MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP

- Limited monitoring
- After the rescue and I was brought back here in Zamboanga, there were no more follow-ups on me up to the time I got married
- No more home visits
- To follow-up on their status to check whether they had stayed or left again.
- The child's reunion with her/his family would be successful, if the child is being monitored
- Nobody visited her anymore from the time she went back to her province
- When the child went home there were no proper follow-ups on her

APPENDIX F

MEAN SCORE OF SURVIVOR AND RATER ON EACH ITEM OF THE INSTRUMENT (Standard Deviation in parenthesis)

Item No.	Survivor Rater	Not at All	To a Little extent	To moderate extent	To a very great extent
		1	2	3	4
1. Were you given counseling after you were reintegrated?	Child SO		2.22 (1.27) 2.75 (1.1)		
3. Were your parents/family/guardians given counseling?	Child SO		1.89 (1.21) 2.375 (1.072)		
5. If counseling was given, did it help you?	Child SO			2.455 (1.25) 2.875 (1.04)	
8. Were you provided a source of livelihood?	Child SO		1.16 (0.6) 1.03 (0.16)		
9. Were there efforts to go after your recruiter/pimp?	Child SO		1.527 (0.92) 1.625 (1.07)		
10. Was legal assistance given to you?	Child SO		1.491 (1.01) 1.83 (1.27)		
11. Are you being protected from being abused / exploited/trafficked again?	Child SO			2.145 (1.09) 2.475 (1.08)	
12. Are you being protected from bad peer influence?	Child SO			2.2 (1.0) 2.35 (0.89)	

13. Were you accepted positively by the community and not teased or ostracized?	Child SO	2.291 (0.952) 2.7 (0.96)
14. Were you given spiritual guidance?	Child SO	1.618 (0.99) 1.875 (1.15)
16. Were the neighbors prepared by NGOs or GOs for your arrival?	Child SO	1.35 (0.84) 1.525 (0.98)
17. Were you housed and helped in a temporary shelter before you were reunited with your family/carers?	Child SO	2.273 (1.23) 2.575 (1.209)
18. Were you asked if you wanted to be reunited with your family/carers?	Child SO	2.491 (1.3) 3.025 (1.2)
19. Are you happy with your life at present?	Child SO	2.2 (1.17) 2.625 (1.07)
20. Do you think that you are now able to protect yourself?	Child SO	2.473 (1.05) 2.65 (0.915)
21. Has your family been given a source of livelihood?	Child SO	1.31 (0.83) 1.175 (0.55)
22. Can your family meet your daily needs?	Child SO	1.69 (0.83) 1.65 (0.8)
23. Do you have friends and relatives who	Child SO	2.27 (0.99) 2.525 (2.46)

support you emotionally?		
24. Do you think that you have improved as a person after you have been reintegrated?	Child SO	2.44 (0.99) 2.45 (0.9)
25. Are you more aware now of what is good for your well-being and safety?	Child SO	2.64 (0.93) 2.5 (0.87)
26. Has your community been taught about trafficking and how to protect children from it?	Child SO	1.655 (0.999) 1.9 (1.05)
27. Are your parents/guardians / carers supportive of your welfare?	Child SO	2.36 (0.95) 2.4 (0.84)
28. Do you get assistance for your medical problems?	Child SO	1.564 (0.91) 1.575 (0.87)
29. Has assistance been given to other members of your family in terms of where it is needed, for example, for medical needs, legal issues, etc.?	Child SO	1.364 (0.8) 1.375 (0.7)
30. Have you been referred to agencies that can help you?	Child SO	1.836 (1.08) 1.9 (1.07)
31. Are you doing any vocational, academic, social or livelihood activity that keeps you	Child SO	1.509 (0.94) 1.5 (0.9)

busy?		
32. Do you receive encouragement / coaching to stand up for your rights and reject potential traffickers or pimps?	Child SO	2.109 (1.008) 2.175 (0.897)
33. Do you have peace of mind and sense of freedom from the perpetrators?	Child SO	2.127 (0.9) 2.425 (0.868)
34. Do the local government officials support you in one way or another?	Child SO	1.61818 (0.986) 1.925 (1.016)
35. Are you able to pursue your ambition in life?	Child SO	1.473 (0.69) 1.725 (0.87)
36. Does your family accept you despite what happened to you?	Child SO	2.818 (0.86) 3.225 (0.656)
37. Are you being taught skills to be able to pursue a livelihood?	Child SO	1.509 (0.88) 1.275 (0.64)
38. Are you happy to be reunited with your family?	Child SO	2.564 (1.097) 2.925 (0.99)
39. Are your parents/ guardians being good parents to you?	Child SO	2.655 (0.882) 2.575 (0.84)
40. Are the police supportive of you?	Child SO	1.691 (0.99) 1.825 (0.952)
41. Are you being visited and followed up by an NGO or GO?	Child SO	1.491 (0.92) 1.85 (1.092)