6-8-2012

Risk to Researchers: An Exploration of Issues Experienced by Social Scientists Conducting Research on Social Deviance and Criminal Behavior

Patricia L. Brougham
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

RISK TO RESEARCHERS:

AN EXPLORATION OF ISSUES EXPERIENCED BY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS CONDUCTING RESEARCH ON SOCIAL DEVIANCE AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Patricia L. Brougham

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2012

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Criminology

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Patricia L. Brougham

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 4, 2012 — Signature on File
Timothy Austin, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology, Chair

April 4, 2012 — Signature on File
Rosemary Gido, Ph.D.
Professor Emerita

April 4, 2012 — Signature on File
Shannon Phaneuf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology

April 4, 2012 — Signature on File
Jennifer Roberts, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology

ACCEPTED

Signature on File
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Risk to Researchers: An Exploration of Issues Experienced by Social Scientists Conducting Research on Social Deviance and Criminal Behavior

Author: Patricia L. Brougham

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Timothy Austin

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Rosemary Gido
Dr. Shannon Phaneuf
Dr. Jennifer Roberts

This dissertation outlines the need for greater understanding of the issue of risk to the researcher and methods employed for managing safety while conducting fieldwork. Researchers are sometimes put in dangerous situations while conducting research. The concept of risk to the researcher refers to the possible harm that may occur while in the field or after leaving the research project. This includes physical/health, emotional, legal, and personal/professional risks. The dissertation explores the topic of risk to the researcher, focusing on those engaged in research in the areas of social deviance or criminal behavior. An online survey was used to collect data on issues experienced with research, as well as precautionary steps taken to ensure safety and manage risk while in the field. The population surveyed consisted of social scientist including criminologists and sociologists. Findings include risks experienced by researchers of social deviance and criminal behavior. Results also present safety precautions identified to reduce or eliminate such risk.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This would not have been possible without the support I have received from so many individuals, both friends and family. I am forever grateful for each of you. Your belief in me carried me through moments when I doubted myself.

Dr. Kate Hanrahan, thank you for inspiring me to tackle this topic. Dr. Jamie Martin, thank you for helping me to get things started. Special thanks to my committee who spent much time providing advice, feedback, guidance, and motivation. Dr. Rosemary Gido, thank you for your enthusiasm and energy. You re-ignited my excitement for the topic at a time when I had no spark left. You are a wonderful mentor and friend. Dr. Tim Austin, thank you for all of your positive energy and kind words. I am inspired by you. I still have much to learn from you. Dr. Shannon Phaneuf, thank you for your belief in this research as an important topic. I appreciate your enthusiasm. Dr. Jen Roberts, thank you for all of the time and patience you have given me. You are truly a wonderful advisor and role model. Because of you, I have confidence in my ability to do quantitative analysis. Your guidance has meant the world to me.

To my family, thank you for the love and support you have continued to give me throughout this entire adventure. Thank you for continually asking about “the big D” even when I did not wish to discuss it. Your willingness to listen to me rattle on about the topic and your encouragement means more than you will ever know. To Mom, special thanks for always believing in my dreams. You have always inspired me to follow my dreams and to believe in myself. I would be nowhere in this world without my family. I love you all.

To my friends and faculty from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Salem International University, Plymouth State University, and so many more…you know who you are…thank you for believing in me. Dr. Jeff Cohen, thanks for tutoring me in quantitative analysis. Dr. Tina Freiburger, thanks for reviewing my proposal and providing great feedback. Dr. Cassandra Reyes, thanks for always asking how I'm doing.

To my adoptive families and friends, Pennington clan, Squires family, Howerton-Lynch family, Martin-Verbanic family, Dr. Clarissa Uttley, Dr. Phyllis Freedman, Dr. Jen Osha, Nicole Michaelis, Virginia Olin, and Candy Pennington, thank you for the emotional, physical, and intellectual support. You have supported me when I needed to vent or cry; you have fed me when I was too tired to cook for myself; and you have spent endless hours providing me with helpful feedback. Thanks for all of the meals, supportive talks, and distractions from work when I needed it. I hope you all know how much I love and appreciate you. Special thanks to Dr. Clarissa Uttley for all of the phone calls, Skype sessions, and DC escapes. You are the best!

Last but not least, I must remember the little critters in my life. Casey, Nani, and Beanie always reminded me to take time for the important things in life…romping through the house, running through the yard, barking at the wind, and belly scratches. Their gentle nudges would also remind me when it was time to quit working and go to bed. Occasionally, a cold nose to wake me in the morning would remind me to get back to work.

This process has been an adventure with many ups and downs. Getting through it was not just a matter of drive and determination. It was a learning process in which I have grown much. It was a humbling experience and a challenge. I survived it because I

surround myself with good people. This dissertation was a team effort in so many ways. I am sure that I have overlooked someone's name in this section. You know who you are, you are my friend, and I appreciate you. Thank you all for what you give me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the last 30-40 years, the fields of criminology and sociology have produced a large body of research in the areas of deviance, crime, and criminals. It is, therefore, logical to assume that at least a portion of these researchers have encountered danger or risk during their research. Certainly, dangers of assault, rape, robbery, arrest, harassment, verbal abuse, infection, and disease are among the possible hazards of conducting research (Van Maanen, Manning & Miller, 1995). Yet, dealing with risk has not received considerable attention by criminologists (Goldsmith, 2003). It was the purpose of this research to discover the types and extent of risk experienced by social scientists researching social deviance and criminal behavior. Furthermore, it was the author's goal to establish safety guidelines that can be used prior to entry into a research project on social deviance or criminal behavior.

For the purpose of this dissertation, the term *research* encompassed both quantitative and qualitative fieldwork as well as non-fieldwork-based research endeavors. *Fieldwork* included the utilization of such techniques as ethnography, interviewing, administration of surveys, or other forms of research that takes the researcher out of their normal place of business. *Non-fieldwork* events were research activities conducted in the researcher's home or normal place of business. It was recognized that researchers do conduct data collection procedures (i.e. surveys, interviews) within their place of business or personal office. However, due to the gap in literature on risks involved with non-fieldwork research, the reader will notice that the bulk of the literature review on risk was centered on qualitative fieldwork experiences. The intent of this research project was to

shed new light on risks experienced by quantitative and qualitative researchers conducting projects both in and out of the field.

The concept of *risk* referred to the possible harm or negative consequences that may occur while conducting research or as a result of the research project. This included physical, emotional, legal, and personal/professional risks. Based on available accounts, it was clear that risk does occur to researchers studying social deviance and criminal behavior (Israel, 2006; Vanderstaay, 2005; Marks, 2003; Sampson & Thomas, 2003; Nilan, 2002; Scarce, 2001; Sonenschein, 2001; Westmarland, 2000; Calvey, 2000; Jamieson, 2000; Mattley, 1998; Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992; Kirby & Corzine, 1981, Perrone, 2010; Hopper & Moore, 1990; Liebling, 1999; Miller, 1986). However, the extent or prevalence of such risk was unknown. Unlike many other occupations, there were no yearly statistics available to demonstrate the extent of occupational hazard experienced by social scientists. The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides information on rates of illness and injuries (fatal and nonfatal) for many types of industry. For example, construction had a nonfatal injury incidence rate of approximately 6.5 per 100 full-time workers during 2004 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2005). During that same year, the incidence of nonfatal injury rate was approximately 5.5 per 100 full-time workers for the category of Education and Health Services (BLS). The Education and Health Services category included a wide range of occupations that might include social scientists. There was no breakdown of statistics to demonstrate the rate of incidence of injuries and illness for social scientists specifically. There were no data to demonstrate the risks of engaging in research (Bloor & Wood, 2006). More specifically, there was no existing body of knowledge on the extent of risk for social scientists

exploring social deviance or criminal behavior. The intention of this research project was to fill that gap in knowledge.

There were no universally established guidelines for conducting research on social deviance and criminal behavior. While there were a handful of universities which do require that researchers follow some safety guidelines, these guidelines were not specific to dealing with deviant and criminal subjects or environments. They were generally dealing with laboratory or geological/anthropological research activities. An IRB or ethics committee is typically concerned only with the possibility of risk for participants (Nilan, 2002). It was routinely left to each researcher to ensure their own safety. While examining the issue of risk to the researcher, established safety protocols and techniques employed by researchers to manage such risks were explored. Information uncovered during the course of this research project holds potential to develop into a safety protocol or safety guide that will provide knowledge and awareness of possibilities for risks associated with research as well as suggestions for safety precautions and methods for managing risk.

There was a need to educate students of the dangerousness of conducting research; however, there was little information available for educators to inform a course of study. According to Howell (1988), researchers need to be sensitized to the risk they may face. She suggested that researchers share experiences of risk and advice on prevention strategies. It is the researcher's training that leads to successful fieldwork (Polsky, 1985). However, it was rare that the topic of fieldwork dilemmas were included as a topic in textbooks or research methods courses (de Laine, 2000). In addition, there were no materials discovered during the development of the literature review that could

assist in preparing those who conduct non-fieldwork based research. It seemed that there was an assumption that non-fieldwork based research was not risky. This may be a poor assumption.

While there were some narratives and anecdotal examples, there had been little in-depth research conducted on the risk experienced by researchers, specifically within sociology and criminology. With the exception of Howell's study on risk to anthropologists conducting fieldwork, the literature appeared to be lacking in-depth studies on the issue of risk to researchers; even less had addressed the risks faced by those entering into the world of social deviance or criminal behavior research. Furthermore, there was very little literature on risks experienced while conducting non-fieldwork based research. The current research utilized quantitative methods to gather data on types and extent of risks encountered by researchers.

While there were some safety guidelines available, most IRB committees do not require researchers to take steps to ensure their own safety before entering into a research project. Guidelines discovered during the literature review may be beneficial to researchers of social deviance and criminal behavior. However, it was not known if these safety precautions were routinely used by researchers. Furthermore, it was not known what precautions are best at reducing or eliminating the experience of risk. This project aspired to discover successful safety precautions used to reduce or eliminate the experience of risk. This research holds potential to bring forward awareness and knowledge to fill the gap in literature on risk to the researcher.

The following questions were addressed in this dissertation research: 1) what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance

or criminal behavior, 2) what types of risks are experienced most by social scientist studying social deviance or criminal behavior, 3) are there mediating factors that effect the occurrence of risk, 4) what, if any, safety precautions do researchers employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior, and 5) what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers face many dangers (e.g., injury, illness, emotional distress, violence, death) when entering the field. However, the full range of risk experienced and the extent of risk was not known. Howell's (1990) study, primarily on researchers in the field of anthropology, is perhaps the most extensive study on risk to the researcher. There have been a few other studies (Kenyon & Hawker, 1999; Johnson & Clarke, 2006; Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, & Liamputtong, 2007; Bloor, Fincham, & Sampson, 2007) that shed light on risk and provide examples of the emerging recognition of the issue of risk faced by researchers. However, these studies focus almost entirely on qualitative fieldworkers. It is not known if researchers using methods other than qualitative fieldwork experience similar risks. These studies were reviewed along with some individual narratives from researchers who experienced risk while conducting fieldwork or after completion of the research. It is noted that anthropology fieldwork is risky and Howell has established an extensive base of data on risk for anthropologists; therefore, this discipline as a whole was not explored extensively. This review was centered primarily on sociologists and criminologists.

This literature review begins with an examination of contextual information, elements that put the experience of risk in perspective. This includes descriptive information about the research methods, researcher, topic under study, population under study, and research environment. It is followed by a review of types of risk experienced by sociologists and criminologists in their quest to learn about social deviance or criminal behavior. It examines emotional, physical, legal, and personal/professional risks. The last

section reviews safety guidelines and protocols. Some of these are suggestions made by fieldworkers on precautions for entering the field, while others are guidelines required by an IRB. It is through a review of this information that an understanding of the types of risks and safety precautions can begin to be developed.

Contextual Factors

A review of contextual factors is important to this research. Contextual factors are background elements that put the experience of risk in perspective. This includes descriptive information about the research methods, researcher, topic under study, population under study, and research environment. There are a variety of methods used to collect data. Within the social sciences, data are either qualitative or quantitative and their collection is done by means of fieldwork or non-fieldwork-based research. Researchers may even combine approaches for a mixed-method research project. Fieldwork is typically considered to be research conducted outside of the researcher's normal place of business. Non-fieldwork research is typically conducted within the researcher's place of business or a laboratory-type setting (controlled environment). The three basic ways data are collected is by: "(1) asking questions, (2) making observations, and (3) examining written records" (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005, p. 210). Data gathering techniques include the use of surveys, psychological testing, observation, participant observation, interviewing, case study, and review of documents. All of these data gathering techniques may take place in or out of the field. Researchers go into crack houses, half-way houses, and prisons. Research is conducted within a researcher's place of business or other areas under her control. There are even some types of research that involve the researcher putting himself directly in line for the experience of risk.

Hunter S. Thompson first introduced the term *edgework* in his journalistic writings about drug use and his experiences with researching Hell's Angels (Lyng, 1990). *Edgework*, defined as "voluntary risk-taking", (Lyng, 1990) is a term used in ethnography. The term has been more commonly used to describe those who actually participate in extreme sports or daredevil type activities, rather than those who research them. However, due to the fact that some researchers participate in the very subject they are studying and voluntarily put themselves in harm's way, they can be considered edgeworkers. *Edge ethnography* is a newer term used to describe researchers utilizing covert or full participation methods to conduct edgework research (Tewksbury, 2009). While the illustration of edgework or edge ethnography is noteworthy, it does not apply to all researchers entering fieldwork.

It should be noted that while those conducting edge ethnography enter research with an understanding of the risk they may encounter, many social researchers may not fully comprehend risk until they are in the process of research. However, when reviewing the literature on risk, the reader will notice that the literature is focused almost entirely on qualitative fieldwork. There are only a few examples of non-fieldwork based risks. This invites a question for what types of risk are experienced by both qualitative and quantitative researchers employing data collection techniques involving both fieldwork and non-fieldwork methods. There is a gap in the knowledge base pertaining to risk experienced within all research methods. This research project intended to fill that gap by collecting information on the experience of risk from researchers employing all types of research methods to study social deviance and criminal behavior.

Beyond the research method is the researcher. Is it possible that risk occurs more to some researchers based on factors like gender, age, or level of experience? Inexperienced researchers are at greater risk because they are not able to anticipate the risk that awaits them (Paterson, Gregory, & Thorne, 1999). Students sometimes take part in research (Morris & Marquart, 2010; Pogrebin, 2010). This may be during a methods course or as part of a thesis or dissertation project. "Novice researchers may be especially at risk, as they are often more concerned with their methodology and response rate than ensuring their own safety" (Sharp & Kremer, 2006, p. 321). According to Lee (1995), a researcher's first fieldwork endeavor is a type of rite of passage, whereby the young researcher must survive on his own. This indicates that researchers with a lower level of experience may enter research unprepared for the risks that await them.

Vanderstaay (2005) provides an example of a researcher's first fieldwork experience that does not go well. He describes an experience with fieldwork that left him with feelings of guilt and suffering secondary trauma. Vanderstaay began dissertation research on the topic of the relationships between schools and the juvenile justice system. Vanderstaay's study of one juvenile led him to face ethical dilemmas regarding his own level of intervention in the life of the subject. He was left feeling that his involvement contributed to the situation in which the juvenile subject killed a family friend. Vanderstaay did not finish this dissertation work and would not write about it for another ten years. He states that he entered the field unprepared for such ethical situations and with no emotional support in place to assist him in dealing with the stress of the experience.

Untrained researchers entering into dangerous settings are even more vulnerable to risk because of their inexperience (Lee, 1995). Lee states that "it is difficult to escape the conclusion that more attention should be paid, particularly within graduate education, to potential safety hazards and ways of dealing with them" (p. 74). Austin (2003) reports that as a graduate student he was not told of the possibility that fieldwork would be hazardous. He was left with the impression that it would be adventurous. When Austin first began exploring Filipino justice issues, he did not realize that his fieldwork would involve risk to his life.

It is also suggested that gender plays a role in the experience of difficulties during research (Arendell, 1997; Gurney, 1985; Easterday, Papademas, Schorr and Valentine, 1977). Liebling (1999) reports that the interactions were different for male and female members of her research team conducting interviews with prisoners. Perrone (2010) reports that during her research on drug use, "some prospective male participants asked for sex or nudity as payment for their involvement in the study" (p. 22). Inciardi (1993) suggests that women should not enter the crack house research environment due to the potential for rape. For Sampson and Thomas (2003), being female most likely contributed to their experience of sexual harassment while conducting research on seafarers. Westmarland (2000) offers a slightly different view. In conducting research with police, she noticed that being a female seemed to bring about a protective nature in the male officers. This would indicate that in some research projects, being female may provide a protective factor. But is risk a gender issue? Furthermore, is it a female issue? According to Paterson, Gregory, and Thorne (1999), the experience of risk to researchers is not strictly a gender issue; "researchers of both genders have experienced threats to their

safety by persons of either sex" (p. 261). Gender does not produce risks, but rather it may amplify existing risks in certain settings (Bloor, Fincham, & Sampson, 2007). "In some cases the characteristics of the researcher with respect to participants may create the conditions for harassment or violence" (Sharp & Kremer, 2006, p. 318). It is inferred that risk is associated with the environment, as well as, participants and topic under study (Paterson et al, 1999).

Research is conducted on a variety of topics involving an array of individuals of different ages and genders living in different geographical settings. Sociologists and criminologists conduct research on topics such as *drug addicts* (Perrone, 2010; Inciardi, 1993), *strippers* (Price-Gynn, 2010; Israel, 2006), *burglars*(Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992), *police* (Westmarland, 2000; Van Maanen, 1988; Marks, 2003; Holdaway, 1983; Goldsmith, 2003), *gangs* (Hopper & Moore,1990; Venkatesh, 2008), *phone sex workers* (Mattley, 1998), and *sex in public places* (Humphreys, 1968). However, a breakdown of risk across the range of research topics or locations has not been discovered during the review of literature. How does the environment or population under study affect the type or amount of risk experienced? Information on gender and age of population, as well as geographical location and setting for the study, are explored in this dissertation research.

Contextual elements include data collection method, researcher demographics, topic of study, population under study, and research location or setting. It is important to explore these elements in relation to the experience of risk in order to formulate an accurate illustration for the occurrence of risk. In the next section, this review proceeds to outline the variety of risks experienced by researchers.

Risks Experienced by Researchers

This section reviews different types of risks experienced by researchers in the fields of sociology and criminology. This literature review has uncovered some narratives on fieldwork that reflect great risk to the researcher. Researchers have reported experiences that fall into categories of emotional, physical, legal, personal and professional risks. It should be noted that little literature on this topic for non-fieldwork based researchers was discovered during the course of the literature review.

Researchers are expected to be objective in their report of research. Perhaps for this reason, the emotions experienced by the researcher have escaped many publications. The literature that follows illustrates various risks experienced by researchers. It should be noted that emotions overlap the other risk categories. It would be naïve to think that someone could experience legal, physical, personal, or professional difficulties without experiencing some serious emotions. Therefore, the following literature provides an introduction to some accounts of emotional experiences, followed by physical, legal, and personal/professional risks.

Emotional Risks

Due to the stressful situations researchers face, mental illness and emotional stress are a concern. In Howell's (1990) study of anthropologists, 14% of the respondents reported experiencing depression and 16% reported problems with anxiety while in the field (p. 153-154). Alcoholism and drug abuse can be contributing factors to mental illness or other problems. Of the 204 participants in the Howell study, 16% reported that others in their group had a problem with alcoholism and 11% reported others in their

group had a problem with drug abuse while in the field (p. 154-155). These issues could also be experienced by sociologists and criminologists.

According to Liebling (1999), as her research team's time in the field went on, their interviews with prisoners became "harrowing" to the point of being "traumatic encounters" (p. 150). Team members would often emerge from interviews exhausted and upset. Liebling reports that the team members would engage risky behaviors such as alcohol abuse and driving in an unsafe manor to relieve stress.

Respondents in a study by Kenyon and Hawker (1999) reported feelings of "isolation, vulnerability and/or fear" while engaged in fieldwork (p. 317). An example of this type of emotional stress is provided by Miller (1986) who conducted research on street women, female hustlers and prostitutes. She interviewed women in various settings such as halfway houses and prison. While conducting interviews in a prison, she was sometimes interrupted by male inmates who caused her fear. On one occasion, she was alone in a prison chapel, waiting on an interviewee, when a male inmate entered. During her conversation with the man she feared that he was thinking about sexually assaulting her. The person Miller was to interview entered the room and ran him off. On another occasion, while at a home for women, she was watching TV with some of the women when a man on a motorcycle arrived. Miller reports that he gave her the message that she was not welcome there. She reports feeling physically threatened on that occasion.

Johnson and Clarke (2006) studied social scientists researching sensitive issues (i.e. cancer, HIV/AIDS, dying, death). They revealed that researchers have difficulty dealing with their own personal feelings that arise in the course of the research. The respondents in the Johnson and Clarke study reported feeling isolated and unsupported in

dealing with many emotional issues. These feelings may exist because those in a position of authority do not have an understanding of the issues experienced by the researchers. Furthermore, they are not able to provide counseling to help them deal with such issues. The supervisors may also not be aware of the issues if researchers are unable to discuss the issues they experience.

Lecocq (2002) raises the point that many researchers do not express or discuss their feelings, especially feelings of fear because of the emphasis that one must remain neutral while conducting research. The researcher is expected to remain objective and detached. Thereby leaving any personal reflection and what might be viewed as contamination out of the analysis report on the research endeavor (Punch, 1986). The element of fear has received little scholarly attention, especially within the discipline of criminology (Goldsmith, 2003). This is most likely because most researchers manage difficult situations without experiencing major harm (Goldsmith, 2003). For example, Price-Glynn (2010) reports that although she did not directly experience any major issues, she did fear possible aggression from men while conducting research in a strip club (p. 207). Jamieson (2000) recounts that on many occasions when interviewing youth of varying levels of deviance or criminal behavior, she feared for her physical well-being. Jamieson points out that entering an unfamiliar environment can lead to feelings of stress and apprehension. She recalls several occasions where she went to meet with one youth and found herself surrounded by a group of males. Austin (2003) reports that while conducting research in Mindanao he felt the need to be on guard. When talking about working with the police, Van Maanen (1988) also expresses the experience of fear. Experience of this type of fear or feeling the need to be on constant alert would cause the

researcher immense stress. Calvey (2000) reports this type of stress in his account of research as a doorman. He expresses the experience of tremendous fear while walking home one evening after a particularly threatening encounter. He likened the research encounter with a "paranoid nightmare" (p. 51). This line of information begs inquiry as to how these researchers prepare for the emotions they may face.

Miller (1986) experienced other feelings during the course of her research on street hustlers. She felt "angry, generally upset, and depressed" (p. 189). She was angry that children grew up in the types of situations she was hearing about and that people could be so brutal to one another. She was depressed over the lack of options for the women and upset that society bred the kind of hatred, discrimination, and inequality she was seeing. Miller did make mention that as paralyzing as her emotions could be, they "were rather motivating forces with regard to the research" (p. 189).

Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong (2007) point out that researchers conducting secondary analysis also experienced emotional issues including "sleep disorders, emotional changes and a need for social support" (p. 328). Kinard (1996) found that researchers reviewing case records of abused children experienced sadness, anger, frustration and a sense of powerlessness. There was a similar discovery for researchers reviewing case records of rape victims. The researchers reported the experience of emotions similar to those reported by victims of rape (Alexander, de Chesnay, Marshall, Campbell, Johnson, & Wright, 1989). They reported feelings of anger, anxiety, fear, and sadness. They also experienced insomnia, nightmares, nausea and generalized pain.

Sampson and Thomas (2003) report that long hours of study, combined with the isolation of being on a ship, created emotional stress for them. They report one incident in which a researcher was confronted with great hostility by the captain of the ship. He isolated the researcher from the crew while they were out to sea for 16 days. Other researchers who report experiencing hostility include Marks (2003) and Wright, Decker, Redfern, and Smith (1992). Marks experienced hostility from both sides of the law while conducting a study on police in South Africa. Wright, Decker, Redfern, and Smith (1992), who were studying active residential burglars, encountered hostility from subjects who feared that they were being set up.

When research experiences become stressful or dangerous, emotions are sure to surface. If not dealt with appropriately, these emotional issues can lead to issues of substance abuse and reckless behavior as described by Liebling (1999). Individuals could be left emotionally scarred by events encountered during the course of research. The accounts of emotions uncovered in this section of the literature review include feelings of fear, depression, isolation, anger, vulnerability, stress and apprehension. This review uncovered emotional issues in accounts of both fieldwork and non-fieldwork based research. This review of emotions in research leaves a question of how researchers prepare to deal with the emotions that may arise during the course of research. Next, there is a review of physical risks experienced by researchers.

Physical Risks

Physical dangers exist in various forms when conducting research. Respondents in a study by Kenyon and Hawker (1999) reported issues of a serious nature including physical assault, a shooting, sexual assault and a near rape. This section on physical risk

will begin with a review of risks due to guns. Guns can be a very serious danger for those conducting research with deviants and criminals. There are some narrative accounts that illustrate this danger. For example, Inciardi (1993) was present in a crack house once when a gun was fired in another room of the house. Everyone hit the floor. Fortunately, no one was hurt. Another example is provided by Hopper and Moore (1990) who had guns pulled on them one morning when they entered a bikers' camp while conducting research on motorcycle gangs. The bikers, sleepy and hung over from the previous night's party, thought Hopper and Moore were competing gang members. They very well may have been killed or experienced serious injury if one biker had not recognized them and interceded on their behalf.

Marks (2003) also encountered risk from guns on several occasions as she embarked on routine patrols with officers, often entering into situations knowing that she may not survive the day. It was typical to be shot at while on routine patrol. Westmarland (2000) further illustrates the physical risks associated with conducting research with police. Like Marks, Westmarland wore a bulletproof vest or anti-stab vest while observing police in England. On one occasion she was forced to hide behind a tree to avoid being shot by an offender. Venkatesh (2008) also describes a gang shootout in which he was forced to take cover while watching others get shot.

Another example of gun risk is provided by Calvey (2000). He conducted ethnographic research on door supervisors, often called bouncers, in Manchester, England. Many of the *doors* were associated with organized criminal gang activity and it was common for an organization to attempt to establish a new club as their territory. Therefore, the doormen were routinely in a dangerous position. On one occasion the

doors were locked, not allowing any customers to leave, because there were a few threatening men outside with guns. Later that evening, after closing the club, the same men returned. As they attempted to gain entry, the owner, doormen, and staff hid in the basement and called law enforcement for assistance.

These anecdotal examples illustrate the very real danger of gun risk that exists for researchers. These examples are drawn from fieldwork experiences. It is not known if gun risks exist for those who conduct non-fieldwork-based research. If one were to consider a researcher who interviews deviants or criminals in her office, it is within reason to suspect that some gun risks would exist for the researcher. The information on fieldworkers may be limited, but it is at least illustrative of the existence of risks.

In Howell's study of anthropologists, five out of the 204 participants reported attempted murder (p. 94). Of the most severe examples included in this literature is the murder of Annie Le, a Yale University pharmacological graduate student (Vitagliano & Solomon, 2011). In 2009, Annie Le was murdered in her research laboratory where she was conducting biological research. Her body was found inside a laboratory wall. On March 17, 2011, Raymond Clark, III, a university lab technician, plead guilty to both attempted rape and murder of Annie Le. While this example is not taken from the discipline of sociology or criminology, it is noteworthy that such violence could occur in non-fieldwork based research. An example within the field of criminology is the death of Caribbean criminologist, Ken Pryce. He mysteriously disappeared while studying criminality in Jamaica. "His body was later found washed-up on a beach" (Bloor, Fincham, & Sampson, 2007, p. 18). Fortunately, there are not an abundance of examples of death during research.

Of the 204 participants in Howell's (1990) study who had engaged in fieldwork, 39% reported experiencing an interpersonal hazard while in the field (p. 89). Seventeen percent of the participants reported experiencing robbery. Assault was reported by 10% and rape or attempted rape was reported by 2%. Howell indicated a belief that the occurrence of rape is most likely underreported in her study. Kenyon and Hawker (1999) also had respondents who reported physical assault, sexual assault and a near rape. There are some narrative examples from the literature that fall into a category of interpersonal violent risks. For example, as graduate students, Sharp and Kremer (2006) experienced sexual harassment and intimidation during research projects. Sampson and Thomas (2003) also report experiencing sexual harassment while conducting research on seafarers. One might consider that females researching deviant populations may find themselves in locations and at times that make them especially vulnerable to sexual harassment or assault (Lee, 1995). However, it is not only the criminal or deviant who pose a threat to female researchers. Stanko (in Lee, 1995) surveyed female members of the American Society of Criminology about sexual harassment. He found that one in three of the respondents had been on the receiving end of sexual comments or sexual harassing behavior. This behavior was perpetrated by police, prison officers and court officials. This information invites the question, is sexual harassment encountered only by females?

Another example of violent risk is provided by Blackman (2007). During his fieldwork on homeless families, Blackman was physically attacked by a man who thought he was someone else. Liebling (1999) provides another example of risk of

violence. While interviewing a prisoner, Liebling had a pen plucked from her hand. The prisoner pointed out that if he had wanted to he could kill her with the pen.

Once again the narratives give perspective to the experience of physical risks that are encountered during research. It is reasonable to suspect that such events do also occur for those involved in non-fieldwork based research. Predicting such violent physical risks is difficult. One must wonder how a researcher can prepare for every occurrence of risk. This would simply not be possible. However, it is possible to be aware of the existence of risk and have a network of support in place.

Not all risks present a direct danger to the researcher. Wright, Decker, Redfern, and Smith (1992) report their most dangerous experience occurred while driving with a subject in the car. The subject saw someone on the street and wanted the car stopped so that he could get out of the car and kill the individual. They managed to calm the subject after refusing to stop the car and driving away from the area. The management of a volatile subject could weigh heavily on the researcher. Certainly, to be present when the subject acts in a violent manner would have some impact on the researcher.

Researchers are also sometimes placed in harm's way due to the political climate of the country in which they are conducting research. These fieldworkers are sometimes viewed as spies working with or helping the enemy. Thirteen percent of respondents in Howell's (1990) study of anthropologists reported being suspected of spying while conducting fieldwork (p. 97). Five of the 204 respondents noted being involved in a hostage-taking event while in the field (p. 99). Perhaps most of the sociologist and criminologist studying social deviance and criminal behavior are doing it in countries of a more stable political climate. However, this does not rule out the possibility of them

being suspected of spying or being held hostage. These types of risks are well illustrated by Venkatesh (2008). In the beginning stages of his research on gangs, Venkatesh was held hostage in a stairwell. The gang members thought he was a member of a rival gang and that he was there to spy on them. On that occasion, gang members attempted to intimidate him by flashing guns and knives in a threatening manner.

This review indicated that there are some research situations that can lead to physical risks for researchers. This includes situations of research that involve a volatile subject, sexual harassment, or being suspected of spying. The physical risks reviewed in this section included physical assault, gun violence/shooting, sexual assault, rape, murder and being held hostage. Though research may be dangerous and stressful at times, some individuals encourage others to enter those research adventures in pursuit of knowledge. Austin (2003) is one such researcher who admits to the dangers of fieldwork, while expressing enthusiasm for the amount of knowledge which can be collected in the field. He expresses the belief that what looks and feels like a dangerous environment may not be as dangerous as expected. With some precautions, research can be conducted even in physically intimidating environments. The question is how to best prepare for research that may present physical risks. The next section reviews legal risks that may cause the researcher some difficulty.

Legal Risks

Legal problems may arise as a result of conducting research. Two main areas of research that seem to capture the interest of police and prosecutors have been illegal drug culture and sexology. Researchers have had information confiscated by authorities that wish to prosecute participants in the study (Sonenschein, 2001). Sometimes that data are

destroyed or simply not returned to the researcher for an extended period of time. There have been times when researchers found themselves being pressured to testify against their subjects. Refusal to do so can result in imprisonment. For example, Scarce (1994, 2001) spent 159 days in jail. Police agencies believed that he possessed valuable information and held him in contempt of court for not disclosing such information.

According to Polsky (1985), danger for researchers comes primarily from law enforcement professionals. This is due to the type of information researchers uncover during the course of fieldwork that law enforcement would like to access. Inciardi differs in opinion. He states that while there are dangers from Grand Juries, Prosecutors, and Police, these are not typical issues for researchers (Inciardi, 1993). Law enforcement agencies likely have better information. Inciardi expresses belief that the authorities tend to leave researchers alone. However, researchers do run the risk of being arrested and imprisoned for participation in activities while conducting research (Sonenschein, 2001). This is often the case when the researcher is simply in the wrong place at the wrong time.

An example is provided by Inciardi (1993) who was in a car with three drug users who were giving him a tour of the drug scene when they stopped at a convenience store for one of the men to pick up some cigarettes. The man quickly ran back to the car with cash and a gun after robbing the store. As they fled the area, Inciardi convinced them to let him out of the car. The three men were shortly arrested. Certainly, in this case, if Inciardi had remained in the car he would also have been arrested. Inciardi was not so lucky during a drug bust on a crack house while he was present. On this occasion, he was handcuffed and put in jail. He was later released with no drug charge. Crimes sometimes do happen when a researcher is present and, therefore, the researcher is at risk of arrest.

Another example is illustrated by Humphreys (1968) who was also in the wrong place at the wrong time. He had been standing outside a tearoom (public place for sexual encounters) talking to another man when police approached and asked for his identification. When he refused to provide any information, the police harassed him for not cooperating. Humphreys was subsequently arrested for loitering. As he went through the arrest and jailing process, he felt degradation by the police. Fortunately, Humphreys had a good lawyer and was shortly released.

There are very few protections for the researcher in any of these situations. There are some states that provide exemptions to researchers; however, "the burden of proof, after arrest and seizure," lies in the hands of the researcher (Sonenschein, 2001, p. 212). There is also a process by which the researcher can apply for a federal certificate of confidentiality to protect the research data, thereby protecting the identity of participants (NIH, 2004). The certificate protects the researcher from legal authorities who may try to obtain identifying information on the participants by using court orders or subpoenas. "Any research project that collects personally identifiable, sensitive information and that has been approved by an IRB is eligible for a Certificate" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). This certificate can be obtained regardless of funding source. However, there is no entitlement to a certificate as they are issued by government discretion.

There are few publications about research and legal difficulties. One would expect the risk of a legal encounter to be especially high for those studying social deviance or criminal behavior due to the chances of more direct exposure to illegal happenings. Issues reviewed in this section include the risk of data confiscation, data destroyed, being

pressured to testify, being arrested and imprisoned. The lack of publications on this issue strengthens an argument that more information is needed on this topic to develop a good understanding of legal risks that researchers experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. There is also a possibility that limited publication on this topic indicates that there are not many legal issues experienced by researchers. The next section reviews issues that affect researchers on a more personal and professional basis.

Personal and Professional Risks

Researchers may experience personal and professional difficulties due to their research. The following literature review discusses the occurrence of *stigma* and *ethical dilemmas*. Researchers might experience *stigma*, a type of social disgrace, due to their work. Stigma can affect a researcher on both a personal and professional level. Some researchers are subject to what Erving Goffman called *courtesy stigma* (Kirby & Corzine, 1981; Mattley, 1998; Miller & Tewksbury, 2001). This is when the stigma of the topic is assigned to the researcher and they experience the labeling effect of guilt by association (Kirby & Corzine, 1981; Mattley, 1998; Miller & Tewksbury, 2001). Mattley (1998) more accurately refers to this as a *(Dis)courtesy stigma*. She feels that having a stigma normally associated with deviance transferred to her serves as a discourtesy.

During their research on homosexuals, Kirby and Corzine (1981) found that nonacademic individuals rather than academics more quickly labeled a researcher. Mattley (1998), while conducting a study on fantasy phone sex workers, found that stigma was more of an issue with academics than with nonacademics. Her interactions with colleagues changed as she began to realize that other professionals viewed her

differently. Some male colleagues began to make sexual comments about the study. Many seemed incapable of focusing on the topic as viable and valuable research. They would often ask inappropriate questions about the fantasy phone sex conversations. Many times, Mattley heard from other people that they could not do that type of research. They were clearly not comfortable with the topic. Israel (2006) had similar experiences with stigma during her research on strippers. However, she received much support from her academic affiliations and her family, while it was her friends (especially males) who seemed to associate her with her work.

It appears that when a topic of study is on the outer edges of acceptability, some people may not wish to research it because of the stigma involved. It seems that some people believe in order for the researcher to engage in that *type* of research there must be something distorted about the researcher. Some individuals fear that they will taint their career by associating themselves with the stigmatized subculture. This is an unfortunate outcome of much important research. One must ask if the lack of publications on personal experiences of stigma is due to the researcher's desire to avoid the topic in an effort to self-protect. Or, perhaps not many researchers of social deviance or criminal behavior are labeled with a stigma. These anecdotal examples do not supply enough information to formulate an accurate assessment of stigma as a risk for all researchers.

The experience of an ethical dilemma is another area of concern on both a personal and professional level. Marks (2003) who traveled with the police and directly observed raids, was asked on more than one occasion to take a female suspect into another room and conduct a physical search including her vaginal area. Not only did this

place Marks in a potentially violent position if the suspect were to attack her, but it also raised ethical concerns for the limit of her role as a researcher.

Holdaway (1983) first faced ethical concerns in deciding to conduct covert research of the police. He states that "covert research and the ethical questions it raises create conditions of stress within which the sociologist has to live with himself" (p. 9). Holdaway felt strain over balancing his ethical limits, the research, and his role as a police officer.

Whyte (1981) provides another example of the stress created by ethical boundaries when he decided to vote more than once in an election. He risked his research as well as his freedom when he broke a federal law prohibiting repeated votes. He struggled with his conscience after the illegal act.

Calvey (2000) also struggled with ethical dilemmas during his research. He faced many situations in which he witnessed illegal drug use, theft of door money, and physical assault on people. As part of the job, he also physically restrained people. Calvey openly recounts the emotional dangers he faced as he experienced vulnerability to his sense of self.

Another example is provided by Gans (1962) who conducted research in a slum district. He was not completely honest with his subjects about his role as a researcher because he feared it would limit his access. He reports a feeling of guilt over what he considers to be a misuse of his relationships to gather data.

Textbooks may provide ethical guidelines, but this does not prevent a researcher from facing their own ethical dilemmas. It is not known if these anecdotal accounts of ethical dilemmas are typical of fieldwork or if they are a rarity. It is also not known if

ethical dilemmas are only faced by those engaged in fieldwork. The examples uncovered during the course of reviewing literature are only demonstrative for researchers engaged in fieldwork. There has been no literature reviewed that sheds light on the type of ethical dilemmas experienced by researchers conducting non-fieldwork based research.

This literature review on experience of risk has uncovered some researcher narratives on research (see table 1) that reflect great risk to the researcher. Researchers have reported experiences of emotional, physical, legal, and personal/professional risks. Two primary questions emerge from this review. First, are these typical risks experienced by all researchers? Or more precisely, what risks are experienced by researchers? Perhaps there are other experiences not yet revealed in publication. Perhaps the reviewed examples are extraordinary experiences not typical of research. The second question that emerges is how do researchers prepare for the management or risk in order to maintain their personal safety? This question is partially addressed in the next section by a review of safety precautions utilized by researchers.

Table 1
Summary of Researcher Narratives on Risk Experienced

Author(s)	Topic of Study	Setting	Data Collection	Risk Experienced
Blackman (2007)	Homeless young families	Brighton, England	Fieldwork	Emotionally overwhelmed and angry Physically attacked
Calvey (2000)	Club doors	Dance club and a gay pub Manchester, England	Fieldwork	Physical risks Fear Guns Ethical dilemma Vulnerability
Gans (1962)	Working class community	Slum district in Boston	Fieldwork	Feeling of guilt Ethical dilemma
Goldsmith (2003)	Policing and security	Columbia	Fieldwork	Fear of kidnapping and death Frustration Hostility

Holdaway (1983)	Police	Police in the UK	Fieldwork	Stress Ethical dilemma
Hopper & Moore (1990)	Motorcycle gangs	US/various places	Fieldwork	Guns Physical threat
Humphreys (1968)	sex in public places	Public restrooms various US locations	Fieldwork	Arrest Jailed
Inciardi (1993)	Crack houses & drugs	Miami	Fieldwork	Guns Handcuffed Jailed
Israel (2006)	Female strippers	Strip club	Fieldwork	Stigma
Jamieson (2000)	Young people and crime	Scotland	Fieldwork	Physical danger Fear Stress Apprehension
Liebling (1999)	Prisoners – incentives and privileges	Maximum security prison in the UK	Fieldwork	Emotionally traumatic Emotional exhaustion Upset Fear
Marks (2003)	Police	South Africa	Fieldwork	Hostility Guns Ethical dilemma
Mattley (1998)	phone sex workers	Large city in the US	Fieldwork	Stigma
Miller (1986)	Female street hustlers	Milwaukee prisons and half-way houses	Fieldwork	Fear Physically threatened felt “angry, generally upset, and depressed”
Perrone (2010)	Club culture and drug use	New York City	Fieldwork	Sexual harassment
Price-Glynn (2010)	Strippers	Strip club in a rural town	Fieldwork	Fear
Sampson & Thomas (2003)	Seafarers	Cargo ships	Fieldwork	Sexual harassment Hostility Emotional stress Isolation
Scarce (1994, 2001)	Environmental activism	US	Fieldwork	Pressured to testify Confined to jail Held in contempt of court

Sharp and Kremer (2006)	Sharp - Farmers Kremer – masculinity	Farms On-campus office	Fieldwork Non-fieldwork	sexual harassment intimidation
Van Maanen (1988)	Police	Urban city in the US	Fieldwork	Fear
Vanderstaay (2005)	School & Juvenile Justice System	Inner-city urban area	Fieldwork	Emotional stress Feelings of guilt Secondary trauma Ethical dilemmas
Venkatesh (2008)	gangs	Chicago – Robert Taylor Homes	Fieldwork	Held hostage Guns suspected of spying
Westmarland (2000)	Gender and the police	Rural and Urban areas in North-East England	Fieldwork	Guns Physical risks
Whyte (1981)	Street gangs	Slum district in Boston	Fieldwork	Stress Ethical dilemma
Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith (1992)	Active residential burglars	Streets of St. Louis, MO	Fieldwork	Hostility Subject's violence is directed at others

Precautions Before Entering Research

An issue that plagues the research field is that there are no universally established guidelines for entering research, specifically on social deviance or criminal behavior. It is left up to each researcher and the Internal Review Board (IRB) to ensure the individual's safety while conducting research. According to the Social Research Association [SRA] (2001), it is the university or research institute who is responsible to ensure the researcher's safety. However, while a few university IRB committees require some safety measures, most IRB or ethics committees are typically only concerned with the possible danger or risk for participants (Nilan, 2002).

Sampson and Thomas (2003) suggest that steps be taken to minimize dangers. Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong (2008) "recommend that a set of

guidelines be developed for use by qualitative researchers, supervisors, institutions, and granting bodies that are involved in sensitive research" (p. 142). Some researchers have outlined such precautions for entering research (Peritore, 1990; Williams, Dunlap, Johnson, & Hamid, 2001; Kenyon and Hawker, 1999; Lee, 1995; Paterson, Gregory, and Thorne, 1999; Sluka, 1990, Morris and Marquart, 2010; Belousov, Horlick-Jones, Bloor, Gilinskiy, Golbert, Kostikovsky, Levi, and Pentsov, 2007; Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong, 2008; Sharp & Kremer, 2006). While these steps may provide some protections, it is not established that they will be the best precautions for all types of research. The SRA (2001) also provides a code of practice for those who fund research, employ research managers, or conduct research. The SRA code includes safety guidelines for fieldwork based research. While the following review of suggestions for safety is focused on fieldworkers, it is possible that some of these suggestions would assist the non-fieldwork based researcher as well. It should also be noted that there is no assurance that taking precautions will eliminate all forms of danger. Risk is unpredictable and difficult to avoid (Wright et al., 1992). For example, Sharp and Kremer (2006) experienced difficulties during research as graduate students. "While we had both prepared for the possibility of routine problems encountered during fieldwork, neither of us thought about the possibility of experiencing harassment or intimidation from our subjects" (Sharp & Kremer, 2006, p. 321).

Another point to consider is that some researchers may not wish to eliminate risk. According to Westmarland (2002), it may be counter-productive to eliminate all risk. It is important to be cautious, but danger and risk are essential ingredients in developing a complete understanding of the subject when conducting fieldwork. To a certain extent,

experiencing the same risks as the subjects provides the researcher with an opportunity to understand the issue more clearly. If researchers take so many precautions as to create a completely safe environment, then they may lack insight. However, it would be best if the researcher were at least aware of the possible risks they face in order to mentally prepare themselves for the experience and to take precautions when they are able. Next there is a review of precautions suggested by experienced researchers. It will be followed by a review of some university's IRB safety requirements.

Money Management

Sometimes money is offered as an incentive for interview participation. When researchers carry large amounts of money to pay interviewees, then they could become the target for robbery. Lee (1995) suggests that researchers develop a strategy for dealing with ineligible individuals who wish to participate in the research because of a monetary incentive. Wright et al. (1992) made it very clear to their subjects that they did not carry more cash than necessary to pay the subjects for participation in the research. Such a strategy may prevent robbery. It seems that this caution would be beneficial to researchers engaging both fieldwork and non-fieldwork based projects.

Escape Route

Researchers should develop knowledge of the working environment, geographical area, exit routes, and inform others of where they will be at all times (Morris and Marquart, 2010; Kenyon and Hawker, 1999; SRA, 2001). The need to terminate the research early may occur (Sluka, 1990). Sharp and Kremer (2006) stress that all researchers should know that they can "end an interview if they feel uncomfortable or threatened" (p. 326). In this case, it is suggested that the researcher have a plan for

getting out as quickly as possible. The researcher should visit the area prior to the research. This will provide an opportunity to become familiar with the area (Sluka, 1990; Paterson et al., 1999; Morris and Marquart, 2010; SRA; 2001) and plan an escape route if necessary (Paterson et al., 1999; SRA, 2001). It is also suggested that researchers carry a mobile phone (Morris and Marquart, 2010; Kenyon and Hawker, 1999; Sharp & Kremer, 2006; SRA, 2001). It is wise to let someone know the research schedule and a time to expect the researcher's return. Researchers should make arrangements to contact someone at a designated time (Sharp & Kremer, 2006; Morris & Marquart, 2010; SRA, 2001; Jamieson, 2000). If the researcher misses the appointment, then the contact person will know that there is something wrong and can take appropriate action. This precautionary step could be beneficial to all researchers engaged in projects on social deviance or criminal behavior.

Risk Assessment

It is suggested that researchers complete a risk assessment before the start of research (Belousov, Horlick-Jones, Bloor, Gilinskiy, Golbert, Kostikovsky, Levi, & Pentsov, 2007; SRA, 2001). Sluka (1990) also recommends that the researcher conduct an evaluation to determine the extent and sources of danger prior to entering the field. A risk assessment can be a formal process or as simple as taking a little time to consider what types of risk the researcher may encounter. Sharp and Kremer (2006) suggests that researchers "discuss the possibility of sexual harassment or intimidation in the field and think about what types of behavior or situations are most likely to occur" (p. 326). Sluka stresses that the researcher should decide what risks they are prepared to accept. A risk assessment could be helpful to all types of research projects.

Style and Demeanor

It is recommended that the researcher pay attention to style and demeanor (Williams et al., 2001). The researcher should try to fit in by dressing in a style for the research environment, paying attention to customs of dress and language (Belousov et al., 2007; Petitore , 1990; Polsky, 1985; Williams et al. 2001; SRA, 2001). Individuals should be careful to present themselves as personable and stable. They should not appear to be a victim. It is further suggested that researchers have an awareness of body language, show respect for respondents, and develop a warm and honest manner in working with respondents (Kenyon and Hawker, 1999). Lack of knowledge about cultural differences may put the researcher at risk (Petitore, 1990). Goldsmith (2003), who has spent many years researching Columbian police, also suggests learning the language. This will aid the researcher to build trust and rapport. Paying attention to style and demeanor could benefit all researchers.

Locator and Protector

The need for the researcher to establish a locator and protector is important for any fieldworker (Williams et al., 2001). A locator is someone within the community who can introduce the researcher and assist with making appropriate connections. The researcher needs to make sure that the locator is a well-respected and trusted individual. The researcher's acceptance in the community will depend on how people in the community view the locator. They will associate the researcher with the locator. If the locator is not trustworthy, the community will not trust the researcher. The locator can also function as the protector. Once the researcher is established in the community, a protector will emerge.

The protector is a person who ensures the researcher is safe. As the researcher builds rapport and trust, different people will fill the role of protector at different times. This individual reminds people to be calm and hold things together when the researcher is present. If someone appears to give the researcher a hard time, the protector steps in to redirect or tell the individual to back off. Williams et al. (2001) have found the role of protector to be especially important in conducting drug research. Inciardi (1993) emphasizes the need to have a protector when researching crack houses. The SRA (2001) also suggests that someone shadow or accompany the researcher on fieldwork assignments to ensure safety. While it appears that establishing a locator and protector would be most beneficial for those entering the field to collect data, they may also be beneficial to non-fieldwork based research projects. For example, non-fieldwork researchers may value someone who can make introductions and assist with making appropriate connections, as well as oversee their safety while they are conducting interviews in their offices.

Develop a Network

Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong (2008) recommend professional supervision and "development of a structured mentoring program for novice researchers who are involved in sensitive projects, to ensure that they are provided with support in a timely and ongoing fashion" (p. 139). Developing a support network is critical for researchers, especially those engaging in research on sexuality (Peritore, 1990; Israel, 2006) or other sensitive issues (Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong, 2008). Israel found that connecting with other professionals and professional organizations can be a source of support. "If researchers are not provided with opportunities to debrief, they

risk the possibility that they will carry their research stories around with them, which may be detrimental to their emotional well-being" (Warr, 2004 in Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, and Liamputtong, 2008, p. 140). Someone with experience can assist the researcher with processing their emotions or devising a plan to deal with possible situations they may encounter. Wright, Decker, Redfern, and Smith (1992) knew that they would be facing potentially dangerous situations when they entered research on residential burglars. Therefore, they contacted the police in the area to establish their presence as researchers and ensure that there would be no legal difficulties. The SRA (2001) also recommends contacting the police before beginning research. Developing a network could be very beneficial to both fieldwork and non-fieldwork based researchers.

Draw the Line

Establishing limits ahead of time on what one is willing to discuss can assist in ending conversations that may not be comfortable (Israel, 2006). The researcher must decide what they are or are not willing to do or witness (Polsky, 1985). The criminal may try to draw the researcher into the crime life. Polsky warns that on occasion a researcher may face unanticipated situations with no management plan. While one can plan dress, speech and some basic behavioral responses, one cannot plan for every possibility. Deciding ahead of time where to draw the line would most likely benefit all researchers.

IRB Safety Requirements

Kenyon and Hawker (1999) acknowledge when they were preparing for dissertation work that their institutions did not discuss matters of best practice for dealing with difficult circumstances they may encounter during fieldwork. When reviewing safety protocols and guidelines required by university Institutional Review Boards (IRB),

it was discovered that most are centered on the safety of the subjects under study. Dickson-Swift, James, and Kippen (2004) conducted a content analysis of 37 Australian university human research ethics committees. They found that only three of the 37 universities required that the applicant address all possible aspects of safety for the researcher including physical, psychological, and emotional issues.

According to Indiana University of Pennsylvania, the purpose for IRBs "nationally is to protect participants in research as well as to protect researchers conducting research involving human participants" (Research at IUP, 2010). Upon further review of IUP's IRB guidelines, there is no mention of safety for researchers facing possible risks. A few universities have guidelines for physical safety of fieldworkers or laboratory workers. For example, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2010) has safety guidelines for international travel, Kent University (2011) in Ohio has laboratory, biological, and radiation safety guidelines, Rhodes University (2008) in South Africa has safety guidelines for fieldworkers, and Florida Gulf Coast University (2008) has a radiation safety manual. While some universities require a risk assessment with plan for managing physical risks, there are very few precautions or required planning to deal with issues of an emotional, legal, or personal/professional nature. The London School of Economics and Political Science (2011) is one of a few that requires a risk assessment for fieldworkers. However, as with many universities, the risk assessment is only required if the research involves fieldwork. There were no safety protocols or guidelines discovered during this review for those conducting research on campus. The main focus seems to be centered on managing or preventing physical risks to fieldworkers.

It should be noted that there are numerous universities and it is next to impossible to review all university IRBs. The review was done based on a search for universities that have a risk assessment, safety protocol, or safety guidelines established within their IRB. It is possible that some universities were overlooked in the literature review. However, given the numerous IRBs that were reviewed there seems to be a general lack of safety requirements for social researchers. Therefore, research must be done to learn what precautions researchers utilize to prepare for entering into research. Then a safety guideline can be established that is specific for researchers studying social deviance or criminal behavior. It is the author's goal to develop a safety guideline that would easily fit into IRB requirements for social research.

There is much to be learned about the necessary precautions for all types of research. It is not known if any or all of the reviewed procedures are typically used by researchers or if the procedures used are successful. A study on this topic is necessary for developing a full understanding of the research experience. This dissertation explores the utilization of precautions and their level of success for social scientists conducting research on social deviance and criminal behavior.

Summary

During the course of the literature review, many anecdotal accounts were used to illustrate issues experienced while conducting research. There were limited in-depth research analysis discovered that took a look at the topic of risk faced by researchers conducting any type of social deviance or criminal behavior research. There is clearly a lack of in-depth research on this topic. Much of the existing information in this arena comes from individual accounts. Many different risks were revealed, including those

categorized as emotional, physical, legal, and personal/professional. Despite Howell's impressions in the discipline of anthropology, the literature reviewed for those studying social deviance or criminal behavior uncovered quite a few individuals who were willing to share their research experiences in reflective accounts of their endeavors (Inciardi, 1993; Humphreys, 1968; Hopper & Moore, 1990; Liebling, 1999; Israel, 2006; Vanderstaay, 2005; Marks, 2003; Miller, 1986; Nilan, 2002; Scarce, 2001; Sonenschein, 2001; Westmarland, 2000; Calvey, 2000; Jamieson, 2000; Mattley, 1998; Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992; Kirby & Corzine, 1981; Venkatesh, 2008; Whyte, 1981; Holdaway, 1983). It is not known if their experiences are typical for research involving social deviance or criminal behavior, or if they are presenting uncommon occurrences. Plus, it is not known if their experiences are consistent with experiences of other researchers using fieldwork or non-fieldwork based research.

There is much to be learned about the necessary precautions for all types of research. The reviewed information provided suggestions for use of risk assessments, money management, style and demeanor, locator and protector, escape route, developing a network, and drawing the line. It is not known if any or all of the reviewed procedures are typically used by researchers or if the procedures used are successful. A study on this topic was necessary for developing a full understanding of the risk experienced by researchers exploring social deviance and criminal behavior.

Contextual elements such as type of data collection used, researcher demographics, topic of study, population under study, and research location or setting are also explored. It is important to explore these elements in relation to the experience of

risk in order to formulate an accurate illustration of the occurrence of risk, as well as the factors that may encourage or protect against such experiences.

This research attempts to uncover the degree or nature of risks experienced by sociologists and criminologists conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. This dissertation explores the context and experience of such risk. Furthermore, it strives to develop an understanding of safety precautions for researchers entering the field. Risks for emotional, physical, legal, and personal/professional issues are explored. This research holds potential to fill the knowledge gap on risk to researchers and to develop a researcher safety protocol or safety guidelines.

This research employed quantitative methods to explore 1) the type and extent of risk experienced by researchers of social deviance and criminal behavior and 2) safety precautions utilized by researchers entering the field. Research questions include: 1) what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior, 2) what types of risks are experienced most by social scientist studying social deviance or criminal behavior, 3) are there mediating factors that affect the occurrence of risk, 4) what, if any, safety precautions do researchers employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior, and 5) what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior? The next section describes the methods, sampling, and analysis techniques.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This exploratory research endeavor gathered information from those having direct knowledge of risk to the researcher. This study has strived to develop an understanding of those risks that exist for social scientists conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Furthermore, it has attempted to develop an understanding of safety precautions for those social scientists entering into research. Risks for emotional, physical, legal and personal/professional issues were explored. This research sought to fill the knowledge gap regarding risk to the researcher while also exploring methods used to reduce or eliminate the occurrence of risk. The following is a list of research questions that were developed from the literature review:

1. What types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior?
2. What types of risks are experienced most frequently by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior?
3. Are there mediating factors that effect the occurrence of risk?
4. What, if any, safety precautions do social scientists employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior?
5. What safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior?

Research questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 did not require hypotheses. Research question 3 did require the use of hypotheses. The following sub-questions and hypotheses were developed to assist in answering research question 3.

1. What is the relationship between a researcher's gender and the likelihood that he/she will experience risk?
   Ha (1) – Women are more likely than men to experience risk.
   Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's gender and the experience of risk.

2. What is the relationship between a researcher's method of data collection and the likelihood that he/she will experience risk?
    Ha (2) – Researchers who use fieldwork as a method of data collection are more likely to experience risk than researchers who use non-fieldwork methods of data collection.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's method of data collection and the experience of risk.
3. What is the relationship between a researcher's age and the likelihood that he/she will experience risk?
    Ha (3) – Young researchers are more likely than older researchers to experience risk.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's age and the experience of risk.
4. What is the likelihood that researchers experience a greater amount of risk during their first research project?
    Ha (4) – Researchers conducting their first research project are likely to experience more risk than those who are not conducting their first research project.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between first research project and the amount of risk experienced.
5. What is the relationship between the age of the population under study and the occurrence of risk?
    Ha (5) – Researchers studying adolescent (age 13-17) and young adult (age 18-24) populations are more likely to experience risk than researchers studying adults (25 and up) and young children (below age 13).
    Ho - There is no statistically significant correlation between age of population under study and the occurrence of risk.
6. What is the relationship between a researcher's level of education and the occurrence of risk?
    Ha (6) – Researchers with a higher level of education will experience less risk than researchers with a lower level of education.
    Ho - There is no statistically significant correlation between level of education and the occurrence of risk.
7. What is the relationship between research country and the experience of risk?
    Ha (7) – Researchers conducting research in an emerging/developing country will experience more risk than researchers conducting research in an economically established country.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research country and the experience of risk.
8. What is the relationship between research location (urban, suburban, rural) and the experience of risk?
    Ha (8) – Researchers conducting research in an urban area are more likely to experience risk than researchers conducting research in a suburban or rural area.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research location and the experience of risk.

9. What is the relationship between research setting (institutional/professional, public, informal) and the experience of risk?
    Ha (9) – Researchers conducting research in an informal setting will experience more risk than researchers conducting research in institutional/professional, public, or other setting.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research setting and the experience of risk.
10. What is the relationship between a researcher's experience of risks and their gender, age, level of experience, level of education, and amount of safety precautions used?
    Ha (10) – Male researchers with greater age, experience, and education who report use of more safety precautions experience less occurrence of risk than female researchers with less age, experience, and education who report use of less safety precautions.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between the experience of risks and a researcher's gender, age, level of experience, level of education, and amount of safety precautions used.
11. What is the relationship between a researcher's level of experience and the amount of safety precautions utilized?
    Ha (11) – Researchers with a higher level of experience are likely to use more safety precautions than researchers with less experience.
    Ho – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's level of experience and the amount of safety precautions utilized.

Next, there is a presentation of the sample, followed by an explanation of the research design, questionnaire construction, research procedures, and the analysis plan.

Sample

The target population for this dissertation was social scientists, primarily criminologists and sociologists, studying social deviance or criminal behavior. This sample was not limited to qualitative fieldwork. As discussed earlier, there was possibility for both quantitative and qualitative researchers collecting data by use of fieldwork or non-fieldwork based methods to experience risk. Therefore, the sample included social scientists who have conducted qualitative and/or quantitative fieldwork or non-fieldwork based research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Certainly there are numerous social scientists in the world that fit this description; however, locating all of

them in order to develop a true random sample would be a lengthy and perhaps cost prohibitive task. In order to establish a list of potential participants, professionals in the fields of criminology and sociology were identified from membership lists for the American Society of Criminology (ASC), the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS), and the Midwest Sociological Society (MSS). These organizations were chosen because they spur further inquiry that advances our understanding of societal issues and they encourage members to conduct research that is contributory. Therefore, within these membership lists, it was likely that a sample would be captured that would lead to a greater understanding of risk to the researcher. ASC has a membership list available online. Invitations for participation in the online survey were sent to those on the membership list. Upon written request, ACJS provided their membership list for inclusion in the study. MSS would not provide access to their membership list; however, with board approval, they forwarded the survey invitation to their members. This included students, faculty, and other professionals. Students were included in the population sampled because it had been suggested that students at various levels of education assist with or directly conduct research. Therefore, it was only prudent to gather their experiences also.

It was recognized that there exist an array of possible social scientists that belong to ASC, ACJS, and MSS. These organizations do not exclusively consist of sociologists and criminologist. It was also recognized that not only sociologists and criminologist study social deviance and criminal behavior. There may be social scientists from other disciplines (i.e., psychology, anthropology) that conduct research on the topic of social deviance or criminal behavior. Those who self-identified as a criminologist, sociologist,

or other social scientist with research experience were included in this research project. Because the focus of this research project was to discover the types of risks experienced by those studying social deviance or criminal behavior, participants were also required to indicate a research topic that falls into the categories of social deviance or criminal behavior. Those who did not meet these criteria were excluded from the project.

This approach generated a purposive sample. A purposive sample is a sample selected "on the basis of our own knowledge of the population, its elements, and the nature of our research aims" (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005, p. 238). With purposive sampling, the sample is typically built from those who exhibit the characteristics we wish to study. Because certain characteristics were specified in this research, a purposive sample is more useful than a probability sample. A probability sample may not provide the extreme cases that may be discovered by use of a purposive sample. In essence, with purposive sampling, the sample is built of a subset of a larger population. Others are eliminated from the study, yielding a sample that can provide rich data from which a deeper understanding of risk to the researcher and safety precautions could be developed. This type of nonprobability sample is useful in exploratory research, such as this project, when attempting to establish whether or not a problem exists, or the extent of a problem (Adler & Clark, 2008).

In order to ascertain the information sought in this research endeavor, a survey was conducted with researchers within the sociological and criminological disciplines studying deviance or criminal behavior who have implicit knowledge and insight into research. Due to the research they have conducted, they were able to offer insights not found elsewhere. According to de Leeuw, Hox, and Dillman (2008), it is not appropriate

to use statistical inference when using a nonprobability sample. “This does not necessarily mean that nonprobability samples are unrepresentative of the population; however, it does mean that nonprobability samples cannot depend upon statistical probability theory” (de Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman, 2008, p. 9). Some limits are noted on ability to generalize to the greater population as generalizability is best applied to the population included in the study. However, because it was expected that many of the members conduct research on social deviance or criminal behavior, the results can be generalized to other professionals outside of the organizations represented who also conduct research on social deviance or criminal behavior.

It is noted that some previous studies utilizing ASC and ACJS membership lists yielded response rates of 80.7% (Pool & Regoli, 1984) and 53% (Sorensen, Snell, & Rodriguez, 2006) for a mail-based survey. Frost, Phillips, and Clear (2007) achieved a response rate of 62% on a request for participants’ curriculum vitae submission following a telephone survey. Each of these organizations holds a large membership; however, it is unknown what percentage of members conducts research on social deviance or criminal behavior. ASC has a membership of approximately 2,700 and ACJS has a membership of approximately 2,800. The membership for MSS is approximately 1,000. This afforded a possible total of 6,500 participants for the study. Even though a low response rate increases the detriments of nonresponse bias, by inviting all members of the organizations to participate, the information acquired would be adequate to develop an understanding of risk to the researcher and methods used to reduce risk.

Design

This research employed a cross-sectional research design, meaning that the data was to be collected at one point in time (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005). In a sense, it is like taking a snapshot of a population (or subset of a larger population) that allows a look at different categories of variables across that population. For this project, it allowed a look at the present day status of risk experienced by social scientists and the safety precautions they utilize. It also allowed for a picture to be formed about the researchers (age, gender, etc.) related to categories and types of risk (emotional, physical, legal, personal/professional), as well as types of safety precautions used to reduce or eliminate risk. Cross-sectional designs are typically useful in exploratory research such as this project.

This research employed quantitative methods. A survey instrument was utilized to maximize the understanding of the experience of risk and safety precautions utilized by researchers. A survey instrument was determined as a beneficial option due to the potential for collecting a great amount of information from a large number of individuals. For several reasons, it was apparent that an online survey would be advantageous to this study. First, due to limited financial resources, an alternative to the ever-increasing cost of postage was sought. Consideration was also given to response rates. A meta-analysis recently revealed that mail surveys have a higher response rate than web surveys (Shih & Fan, 2008). However, it was discovered that the population selected has an effect on the response rate (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Shih & Fan, 2008). Those who are more technologically savvy tend to respond better to web-based surveys (Cook et al, 2000). When controlling for population, it was found that the college populations (students and

faculty) have a higher response rate for web-based surveys than mail surveys (Shih & Fan, 2008). These findings were supportive for use of an online survey in this project, given that a large portion of the participants in this project were most likely employed in academia and accustomed to use of technology.

Online surveys can be designed for ease of navigation by incorporating "pop-up instructions, drop-down boxes, and check boxes" (Umbach, 2004, p. 25). They can also build in skip patterns that eliminate confusion. Van Selm and Jankowski (2006) outline some advantages for online surveys that include "absence of interviewer bias," "removal of the need for data entry," and "convenience for respondents" (p. 439). A link to the online survey can be easily embedded in an email sent to all potential participants. This allows for a diverse geographical population to be reached easily with no added expense. In addition, data entry will be simplified as it can easily be transferred to SPSS for analysis, saving time and money. Umbach (2004) points out that use of an online survey also reduces data entry errors that can sometimes be a result of human error. Since the respondent enters the data while completing the survey, this lowers the chance of error. Taking all of this into consideration, it was decided that the online survey instrument would be most appropriate.

Questionnaire Construction

A survey instrument (see Appendix A) was constructed to gather information on research experiences related to risk. The survey queried respondents on types of risk experienced and types of safety precautions utilized to reduce or eliminate risk. It employed quantitative style questions designed to acquire data that would be used to answer the research questions. The instrument utilized checklist and Likert scales. There

were some demographic and descriptive items included to provide data that could help build a complete picture of the researcher and the research environment. These items also assisted with answering research question three. The research questions will now be reviewed in conjunction with the survey items used to supply appropriate data for analysis.

First, *what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior?* This question was addressed in items 3-6 on the survey instrument. The respondent was asked to think of their three most risky research projects on crime or deviance. They were then asked to indicate what risks they encountered during those specific research experiences. Items 3-6 was to be answered based on one research experience at a time. This line of questions was repeated up to three times if the respondent indicated risk had been experienced in up to three research endeavors. Item 3 (see Table 2) addressed risks to physical well-being and offered a list including assault, held hostage, rape, robbery, shooting, and other. The list permitted the respondent an opportunity to add additional risks for each item. They could also indicate that they experienced no risk in that category. The survey then took them to the next category of risk.

Table 2
Survey Item Three

3. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience physical/health related issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Assault
- ❑ Held Hostage
- ❑ Rape
- ❑ Robbery
- ❑ Shooting
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No physical or health related issues were experienced during this research project

Note that items 4-6 (see Appendix A) were designed in the same manner. Item 4 addressed legal risks and offered a list including arrest, detainment, confiscation of research materials, and pressure to testify. Item 5 addressed emotional risks and offered a list including fear, depression, emotional stress, emotional trauma, and feeling isolated. Item 6 addressed personal/professional risks and offered a list including sexual harassment, suspicion of spying, stigma and ethical dilemma.

The combination of answers on the checklist for items 3-6 were intended to assist with establishing the types of risks that exist for social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior. The answer for question two, *what types of risks are experienced most frequently by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior,* would be based on the frequencies for the risks reported in items 3-6.

Question three was, *are there mediating factors that effect the occurrence of risk?* This question was to be addressed by analyzing demographics and descriptive items in relation to risk. The researcher demographics were covered in items 91-95 (see Appendix A). These included *age, gender, level of education, professional discipline,* and *level of research experience*. Categories for *level of education* included bachelor's degree in progress through doctoral degree completed. Several levels were used in order to include all possible levels of education that may be involved in research. Options for sociologist and criminologist were offered for selection under *professional discipline*. A category of other was also offered as it was recognized that not all those who study social deviance or criminal behavior fall into the category of sociologist or criminologist. For determining *level of research experience*, the respondent was asked how many years they have been conducting research.

Descriptive items related to the research topic, research environment, and population were included in items 8 and 13-20 (see Appendix A). These include items pertaining to whether it is the respondent's *first research endeavor*, *type of research methods used*, *data collection employed*, *research setting*, *research location*, *focus of research topic*, *gender of population under study*, and *age group of population under study*. Efforts were made to ensure that all possibilities were included in the categories for each descriptive item. Categories for *research method* included qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods. Categories for *data collection* included fieldwork, non-fieldwork, and both. The categories for *research location* included urban, suburban, rural, and other. Categories for *research setting* included institutional/professional, public, informal, and other. For *focus of research topic*, a narrative box was offered. This provided participants an opportunity to describe their research. The categories for *age group of population under study* included young children (under 13), adolescents (13-17), young adults (age 18-24), and adults (ages 25 and up).

Questions four and five, *what, if any, safety precautions do researchers employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior* and *what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior*, were combined in items 62-89 (see Table 3) on the survey instrument. The respondent was asked to consider any safety precautions they normally take before starting a research project. They were asked if they have used certain safety precautions as established in the literature review (see Table 3). For each safety precaution they have used, a Likert scale was available for them to indicate the level of success they felt the safety precaution provided. The Likert scale was

used to establish the success of each precaution they indicated that they have used. Item 90 provided a narrative opportunity for respondents to add other safety precautions they have employed which were not included in items 62-89.

Table 3
Survey Items 62-89

62. Have you considered or discussed possible safety issues?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

63. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

64. Have you conducted a formal risk assessment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

65. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

66. Have you identified strategies for addressing boundary violations and harassment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

67. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

68. Have you established a protector - person who ensures the researcher is safe?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

69. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

70. Have you established a locator - person who can introduce the researcher and assist with making appropriate connections?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

71. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

72. Have you developed a professional/social network of support?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

73. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

74. Have you contacted the police in the area to establish your presence as a researcher?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

75. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

76. Have you dressed specifically for the research environment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

77. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

78. Have you acquired protective gear?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

79. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

80. Have you established a route/made plans for getting in and out of the research site?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

81. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

82. Have you established an emergency evacuation plan?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

83. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

84. Have you scheduled telephone checks before and after interviews?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

85. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

86. Have you developed a strategy for dealing with ineligible individuals wishing to participate in the research?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

87. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

88. Have you set limits on topics you are not willing to discuss or behaviors you are not willing to engage?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

89. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

It was suggested that adding some open-ended questions to the survey, allowing an opportunity to provide more insight, would make respondents feel more positive about participating in the research (Manfreda & Vehovar, 2008). A narrative opportunity was included on the survey, both to demonstrate that the respondent's experiences are important to the researcher and to allow the respondent an opportunity to provide information that may not otherwise be included in this project. Respondents were asked to provide any advice they may have for others entering into research on crime or deviance. The information gathered from this questionnaire was used to provide the data needed for developing answers to the research questions. The next section describes the procedures that were followed in this research endeavor.

Procedures

This section provides a step by step description of the processes that were followed for implementation of the survey. The first step in implementing the survey instrument was to obtain membership lists from ACJS and ASC. The ASC membership list was available online. The ACJS membership list was available with approval from ACJS. This approval was obtained from ACJS. These membership lists were combined into one list and reviewed to eliminate duplicate emails. Individuals with no email address was dropped from the list. Once the list was established, it was loaded into the Qualtrics software system. MSS would not provide a membership list. However, upon approval from the MSS board, they agreed to forward the email invitation with a survey link to their membership.

The survey instrument was loaded into the Qualtrics system provided by Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Qualtrics is a user-friendly online survey system provided for student and faculty use. There are many benefits to using this system. There is no direct cost to the student, data can be easily transferred into SPSS for statistical analysis, and there is local tech support available, if problems arise. The system has the capability to house all data for this research project and it allows for several thousand people to be queried for this project. Qualtrics has custom settings for distribution of a survey based on day and time. For these reasons, it was decided that Qualtrics was the best option for implementation of the survey instrument.

Once the survey instrument was loaded onto the Qualtrics system, there were several options for use. A survey link was inserted into individual emails for ASC and ACJS members and into one mass email for the MSS membership list. The system could

track information of ASC and ACJS members who submitted surveys. This assisted in determining who would receive follow-up email reminders. Again, this feature was used with ASC and ACJS, but was not possible with MSS. Also, a link for opting out of further emails was inserted in all contacts sent to ASC and ACJS members.

The next step was to forward an initial announcement (see Appendix B) of the research project to the target population. This type of advance notice can improve the response rate (de Leeuw & Hox, 2008, p. 241). It is also important to provide advance notice because sometimes there is difficulty in establishing authenticity or sincerity of purpose for an online survey sent via email when there is no existing relationship with the sender (de Leeuw, 2008, p. 118). Therefore, it was important to announce the research project prior to sending out an email with a link to the survey. The initial announcement was sent to ASC and ACJS members. This was not possible for MSS.

The third step was to send the email with a link to the survey (see Appendix C & Appendix D). This email included the researcher's contact information in case participants had questions, complaints, or comments. This email also ensured confidentiality and secure transmission of data by cryptographic protection. This may have aided in establishing the participants' confidence in the safety of their information. The software program used limited access to only those selected in the sample and prevented repeat responses. Qualtrics provides safeguards to prevent loss of data in the case of access interruption. If an interruption had occurred, the participant would have been permitted to return and complete their survey without the need to repeat items already answered. Options were available for participants to review and change answers prior to final submission of the survey. ASC and ACJS were included in the Qualtrics

mailing list. However, only a link to the survey instrument was able to be inserted into a mass mailing to MSS members via their board. The MSS board included their own introduction for the survey to their members.

The next step was a follow-up email to reduce non-response (see Appendix E). Response rates tend to increase with only three contacts, prenotification, survey email, and one follow-up reminder (Manfreda & Vehovar, 2008). Response rates tend to decrease with continued follow-up reminders (Manfreda & Vehovar, 2008). Time intervals between contacts can be condensed when using email because respondents can respond to email very quickly. A reminder after two days of sending out the survey email has a better response rate than one sent after 5 days (Leeuw & Hox, 2008). However, Dillman (2008) advises against rapid-fire email as this may irritate people. Therefore, the time frame for the initial prenotification email, the invitation email with link, and the follow-up reminder was 10 days. The prenotification email was sent on a Monday. There is indication that invitations sent during the early morning (Dillman, 2008), particularly between 6:00am and 9:00am (Supersurvey, 2011), receive an increased response rate. Furthermore, research indicates that Wednesday morning invitations receive a better response rate (Faught, 2004). Therefore, the email invitation containing a link to the survey was sent on Wednesday morning, with a follow-up reminder on the following Wednesday. There was only one follow-up email. Again, this reminder could only be sent to ASC and ACJS members, not MSS members. Analysis was delayed for three weeks to allow for some possible late submissions. After this time had elapsed the survey was no longer available.

Analysis Plan

The analysis plan consisted of a number of steps. For the quantitative style questions, descriptive statistics were used throughout the analysis. Descriptive statistics were reviewed for central tendency and dispersion of the variables. Assessments of basic relationships between variables were completed.

The first two research questions are *what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior* and *what types of risks are experienced most by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior?* Data used for addressing these questions are established in items 3-6 on the survey instrument (see Appendix A). Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies will be reviewed to identify the risks that researchers report experiencing. Analysis of frequencies will be used to determine the risks reportedly experienced most by researchers.

Data used for addressing the third question, *are there mediating factors that affect the occurrence of risk,* was derived from survey items 3-6, 8, 14-17, 20, 22-25, 27, 33-36, 39, 41-44, 46, 52-55, 58, 62-79, and 81 (see Appendix F). Most of the hypotheses addressing question three called for bivariate analysis. Only hypothesis 10 required multivariate analysis. Chi-square was used for many of the hypotheses. Linear or Logistic Regression was also used for a couple hypotheses. Chi-square can assist in examining whether or not the observed frequencies are the same as the frequencies that would be found if the variables are independent of each other. In other words, Chi-square helps to determine if there is a relationship between the two variables by looking at the difference between the observed and expected frequencies. Chi-square provides information on statistical significance and will assist in making a decision on whether or not to reject the

null hypothesis. Chi-square was used to analyze the relationships between the independent and dependent variables for hypotheses one, two, four, five, six, seven, eight, and nine. Chi-square was chosen for use in analysis of these hypotheses because of the capability to work with both nominal and ordinal level data. Logistic Regression was chosen for use in analysis of hypotheses three and 10 because of the capability to work with dichotomous dependent variables. Linear Regression was used for analysis of hypothesis 11 because of its ability to work with interval and ratio level data. Regression can assist in establishing strength of the independent variables effects on the dependent variable. It is particularly useful when looking at more than one independent variable in the model. The information provided by utilizing Chi-square and Regression enabled a decision for rejection of the null hypotheses. Furthermore, it assisted in developing an understanding of relationships between the variables.

Questions four and five, *what, if any, safety precautions do social scientists employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior* and *what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior*, were combined in items 62-76 on the survey instrument (see Appendix A). Descriptive statistics were used to explore the types of precautions that are reportedly used by researchers. The frequencies, standard deviations, and means were used to identify the safety precautions that were most successful at reducing or eliminating risks.

In summary, this research project provides new insight and understanding of risks experienced by researchers, as well as, methods for managing the self to maintain safety in the field. This project holds potential to bring forward awareness and knowledge to fill

the gap in literature on risk to the researcher specifically for those studying social deviance or criminal behavior. It is the authors hope to develop safety guidelines or a research safety protocol from information established in this research project.

Strengths and Limitations

The use of entire membership lists from three professional organizations whose members conduct research specific to this study was a benefit to this research. Because of their experience in conducting research, professionals within the fields of criminology and sociology who were surveyed provided for a better understanding of the topic of risk to the researcher. Gathering rich data from individuals within this group added strength to the project.

Typically with use of a nonprobability sample, generalizability would be limited to the population surveyed. However, as discussed earlier, generalizability for this study includes others outside of the organizations surveyed who study social deviance or criminal behavior.

Human Subject Protections

Participation in this study was purely voluntary. There was no foreseen physical danger to participants. Consideration was given to possible ethical issues for this research endeavor. The goal was to do no harm. Attempts must be made to foresee potential harm and prevent it when possible. Participants were made aware of the topic under study before they agreed to participate. There was no consequence for those who did not wish to participate. Also participants were able to withdraw at any point in the study.

Confidentiality was protected and participants were well informed. Again, participants were made aware of the topic under study before they agreed to participate.

There was no need to hide the goal of the study. There was no deceit on the researcher's role in the study. Every precaution was taken to protect participant information. Identifiers were removed from email lists ensuring anonymity.

It is the researcher's intention to share the findings with society. It is the researcher's goal to make information available to the public in the form of safety guidelines or a researcher safety protocol. A document of this nature will be developed that includes information on the types of risks that are experienced by researchers as well as safety precautions they utilize to reduce or eliminate risk.

Implications of Study

Before this study there was limited knowledge available on the extent of risks or issues experienced specifically by sociologists and criminologists using a variety of research methods to study social deviance or criminal behavior. This research now presents potential to enhance and improve safety guidelines or policies for those engaging in any form of research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Information discovered in this research may provide knowledge and awareness of potential for emotional, physical, legal, and personal/professional issues associated with such research. The discoveries of this project hold potential to assist researchers in management of self and research situations while engaged in research. It also adds to the knowledge base for those new to the practice of research so that they do not enter research blindly.

A research safety guideline or protocol will be developed based on information gathered from the questionnaire. The author also intends to present the results of this study at the annual conferences for ASC and ACJS. It is the author's goal to compile and publish this information as a supplemental book for research methods courses. The safety

protocol will include a section on educational training recommendations for providing awareness of possible issues that could be faced during the process of research. This information will contribute to graduate level research methods courses. The protocol will also recommend precautions to take before entering research. It will further recommend particular issues to be considered based on the results from this research. The guidelines will advise putting together a plan for dealing with the most crucial issues discovered in this research. Furthermore, it will provide recommendations for the best safety procedures for dealing with those particular issues. This will include advice for developing a plan or putting a network in place for emotional support, dealing with stigma, ethical dilemmas, and personal professional issues. Based on results from this research the safety guidelines may also recommend that the researcher prepare for some projects by taking specialized training for handling themselves in physically dangerous environments (ex. self-defense or martial arts class). This may include recommendations to buy protective gear (ex. bullet proof vest) or specialized communication devices (satellite or cell phone), as well as, prepare for legal issues that may arise.

As this research adds to the body of knowledge, it holds potential for developing a greater understanding of the issue of risk to the researcher and its implications for precautionary steps before entering research. The establishment of this knowledge base now places emphasis on the need for further research in the area. This information holds potential to contribute to a "best practices" protocol for social scientists engaging in research on social deviance or criminal behavior.

It is the sincere desire of the author to bring awareness of risk to the researcher to those who may be entering research for the very first time. It is through knowledge that

these young people will be best prepared for the issues they may face. A research safety guideline or a safety protocol is the desired result of this project.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the analysis and results pertaining to the experience of risk and the utilization of safety precautions during research. The analysis of data collected in an online survey of social scientists with experience in conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior was used to develop answers for the questions and hypotheses outlined in the previous chapter. The flow of this chapter was designed according to the research questions. First, there is a review of the types and extent of risk experienced by the respondents as it pertains to research questions one and two. This is followed by analysis results for hypotheses pertaining to research question three. The chapter concludes with a review of information pertaining to research questions four and five, safety precautions utilized by the respondents and their assessed success in preventing or eliminating risk.

A total of 5,455 individuals were invited to participate in the survey. A total of 1,065 individuals accessed the online survey. There were 27 surveys with no answers given for any item. These 27 were excluded from analysis, leaving 1,038 surveys for analysis. The resulting response rate was 19%. Of those 1,038 surveys, 805 respondents indicated that they have conducted research on social deviance or criminal behavior. This was a qualifying question to continue with the survey. The 233 respondents who had not conducted research on social deviance or criminal behavior were excluded from the remainder of the survey.

The remaining 805 surveys were used for analysis. Of the 805 respondents, 330 (41%) reported that they had experienced risk due to their involvement in research on

social deviance or criminal behavior. The remaining 475 (59%) respondents reported that they had not experienced risk. Those who had not experienced risk were excluded from questions pertaining to research projects that involved risk. However, those individuals were included in questions on safety precautions and demographics. There were 718 respondents who identified their discipline as *criminologists* (68.8%), *sociologists* (20.2%), or *other social scientists* (11%). It should be noted that among the other social scientists, 16.5% of the respondents identified as sociologists and criminologists. Another 19% identified as psychologists and 12.7% identified as political scientists. Additionally 5.1% of the respondents identified as victimologists. For other demographic information, see the presentation on frequencies in the section of this chapter designated for question three.

Questions One and Two

The first two research questions are *what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior* and *what types of risks are experienced most by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior?* Frequencies were reviewed to identify the risks experienced by researchers. A total of 330 respondents indicated that they had encountered risk while conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Of those 330 respondents, 310 respondents went on to answer questions in a section of the survey pertaining to their research projects associated with risk. The survey offered separate sections of questions for respondents to provide information on three different research projects. Of the 310 respondents who provided information about one research project, 99 of them also reported a second research project involving risk. Twenty-five of those respondents

reported experiencing a third research project that involved risk. The number of respondents was low for the second and third account of risk. Therefore, only the first account of risk was utilized for subsequent analyses.

Respondents were presented with the opportunity to report the types of risk they have experienced. There were four main types of risk listed; physical/health, legal, emotional, and personal/professional. Each list had various options and allowed the respondent an opportunity to add additional risks under the category of *other*. The following is a presentation of the first account of risk.

Physical/Health Related Risks

Of the 310 respondents who answered questions on a risk related research project, a total of 308 answered questions on physical/health related risks (see Table 4). Among physical/health related risks, *assault* was reported by 56 (18.2%) people. This was the most reported physical/health related risk. *Held hostage* was reported by four (1.3%) people, *rape* was reported by three (1%) people, *robbery* was reported by 11 (3.6%) people, and *shooting* was reported by 14 (4.5%) people. Also, 63 (20.5%) people reported an additional risk under *other physical/health related risks 1*. Of those 63 people, 17 (5.5%) reported a second *other* risk. These additional risks reported under *other physical/health related risks 1* and *other physical/health related risks* 2 were reviewed. The second most reported physical/health related risk was *threats,* found within the categories for *other physical/health related risks*. *Threats* were reported by 21 (6.8%) people. Additional *other* risks reported by fewer than five respondents included *sexual assault, exposure to disease, contracted disease, exhaustion, extortion, gunfire, harassment, intimidation, hit by car, insects, lock down in jail, loss of appetite/digestion*

issues, motor vehicle accident, possible airplane crash, placed on hit list, poison-pen letter, sleep difficulty, tear gas exposure, tiredness, and *verbal assault*. The reviewed information on physical/health related risk indicated that a lot of the respondents have not experienced physical/health related risks.

Table 4
Frequencies for Physical/Health Related Risks

Variable		N	%
Assault	No	252	81.8
	Yes	56	18.2
Held Hostage	No	304	98.7
	Yes	4	1.3
Rape	No	305	99.0
	Yes	3	1.0
Robbery	No	297	96.4
	Yes	11	3.6
Shooting	No	294	95.5
	Yes	14	4.5
Other Physical/health related risks 1	No	245	79.5
	Yes	63	20.5
Other Physical/health related risks 2	No	291	94.5
	Yes	17	5.5

Legal Risks

Of the 310 respondents who answered questions on a risk related research project, a total of 305 answered questions on legal risks (see Table 5). Among legal risks, *pressure to testify* was the most reported with 19 (6.2%) people. *Confiscation of research materials* was reported by 16 (5.2%) people, *arrest* was reported by 12 (3.9%) people and *detainment* was reported by seven (2.3%) people. Also, 25 (8.2%) people reported an additional risk under *other legal risks 1*. Of those 25 people, eight (2.6%) reported a second *other* risk. These additional risks reported under *other legal risks 1* and *other legal risks* 2 were reviewed. *Law suit* or *criminal prosecution* was reported by seven

(2.3%) people and *pressure to release information* was reported by six (2%) people. Additional *other* risks reported by fewer than five respondents included *telephone tap, injunction, lack of cooperation,* and *threats of legal action*. The reviewed information on legal risk indicated that a lot of the respondents have not experienced legal risks.

Table 5
Frequencies for Legal Risks

Variable		N	%
Arrest	No	293	96.1
	Yes	12	3.9
Confiscation of Research Materials	No	289	94.8
	Yes	16	5.2
Detainment	No	298	97.7
	Yes	7	2.3
Pressure to Testify	No	286	93.8
	Yes	19	6.2
Other Legal Risks 1	No	280	91.8
	Yes	25	8.2
Other Legal Risks 2	No	297	97.4
	Yes	8	2.6

Emotional Risks

Of the 310 respondents who answered questions on a risk related research project, a total of 309 answered questions on emotional risks (see Table 6). Two of the most frequently reported risks are within the category of emotional risks with *emotional stress* reported by 136 (44%) people and *fear* reported by 115 (37.2%) people. Among emotional risks, *feeling isolated* was reported by 42 (13.6%) people, *emotional trauma* was reported by 28 (9.1%) people, and *depression* was reported by 26 (8.4%) people. Also, 26 (8.4%) people reported an additional risk under *other emotional risks 1*. Of those 26 people, four (1.3%) reported a second *other* risk. These additional risks reported under *other emotional risks 1* and *other emotional risks* 2 were reviewed. The additional

risks (each reported by fewer than five respondents) included *anger*, *anxiety*, *concern*, *frustration*, *disorientation*, *uncertainty*, *timidity*, *lack of support*, and *difficulty in expressing feelings*. The reviewed information on emotional risk indicated that a lot of the respondents have experienced emotional risks, especially emotional stress (44%) and fear (37.2%).

Table 6
Frequencies for Emotional Risks

Variable		N	%
Depression	No	283	91.6
	Yes	26	8.4
Emotional Stress	No	173	56.0
	Yes	136	44.0
Emotional Trauma	No	281	90.9
	Yes	28	9.1
Fear	No	194	62.8
	Yes	115	37.2
Feeling Isolated	No	267	86.4
	Yes	42	13.6
Other Emotional risks 1	No	283	91.6
	Yes	26	8.4
Other Emotional risks 2	No	305	98.7
	Yes	4	1.3

Personal/Professional Risks

Of the 310 respondents who answered questions on a risk related research project, a total of 302 respondents answered questions on personal/professional risks (see Table 7). Another of the overall most reported risks was found within the category of personal/professional risks. *Ethical dilemma* was reported by 119 (39.4%) people. Among personal/professional risks, *stigma* was reported by 61 (20.2%) people, *suspicion of spying* was reported by 47 (15.6%) people, and *sexual harassment* was reported by 17 (5.6%) people. Also, 20 (6.6%) people reported an additional risk under *other*

personal/professional risks 1. Of those 20 people, five (1.7%) of them reported a second *other* risk. The additional risks reported under *other personal/professional risks 1* and *other personal/professional risks* 2 were reviewed. The additional risks (each reported by fewer than five respondents) included *job loss, ban from research location, harassment at workplace, harassment at home, IRB investigation, jealousy, professional ostracism, told to leave country, sabotage, TSA watch list, loss of money, loss of professional advancement, compromised objectivity, resentment,* and *slander*. The reviewed information on personal/professional risk indicated that a lot of the respondents have experienced personal/professional risks, especially ethical dilemma (39.4%).

Table 7
Frequencies for Personal/Professional Risks

Variable		N	%
Sexual Harassment	No	285	94.4
	Yes	17	5.6
Stigma	No	241	79.8
	Yes	61	20.2
Suspicion of Spying	No	255	84.4
	Yes	47	15.6
Ethical Dilemma	No	183	60.6
	Yes	119	39.4
Other Personal/professional risk 1	No	282	93.4
	Yes	20	6.6
Other Personal/professional risk 2	No	297	98.3
	Yes	5	1.7

While each of the survey options for risk were reported by at least one respondent, the risks most reported include the experience of *emotional stress* (n = 136 respondents), *fear* (n = 115 respondents), and *ethical dilemma* (n = 119 respondents). The reported occurrence was low for several areas of risk. That fact does not negate their importance for consideration in the following analysis. For analysis purposes, these risks

were collapsed into one variable representing overall risk, *total risk 1*. Further discussion of this variable was included in the next section.

Question Three

The third question, *are there mediating factors that affect the occurrence of risk,* includes a number of hypotheses intended to assist in developing an understanding of factors that affect the occurrence of risk. Various statistical tests were used in analysis of the hypotheses. The following is a presentation of the variables from the full sample used in analyses (see Tables 8 and 9). It is followed by a presentation of the variables from the report on a research project associated with risk (Table 11).

Table 8
List of Variables (full sample), Coded for Analysis

Variable	N	%
Experience of risk		
Respondent has been at risk or experienced risk due to involvement in research on social deviance or criminal behavior		
No = 0	475	59.0
Yes = 1	330	41.0
	805	
Total Risk 1		
Frequency on amount of risk was transformed into binary variable due to high skew and kurtosis		
0 – 1 risk = 0	589	73.2
2 – 12 risks = 1	216	26.8
	805	
Education		
Respondent highest level of education		
Non-Ph.D. = 0	228	31.7
Ph.D. completed = 1	492	68.3
	720	
Gender		
Respondent gender		
Male = 0	373	52.2
Female = 1	341	47.8
	714	

The variable *experience of risk* was measured by asking whether or not the respondent had ever been at risk or experienced risk due to their involvement in research on social deviance or criminal behavior. This question was answered by 805 respondents. There were 475 (59%) respondents who indicated that they had not been at risk or

experienced risk while 330 (41%) respondents indicated that they had been at risk or experienced risk.

The variable *total risk 1* was created by summing the respondents' reported risks. Respondents were asked to answer several questions about research projects (up to three separate projects) that were associated with risk. Because the first account of risk had the greatest number of respondents (N=310), this account was utilized for analysis instead of the second (N=99) or third (N=25) account of risk. The variable *total risk 1* was created by adding together the total of reported risk for the first research project examined. Recall that 475 respondents indicated that they did not experience risk and were not included in questions pertaining to a research project associated with risk. Their assigned value for *total risk 1* was zero. *Total risk 1* ranged from 0 to 12 and the data had a positive Skew of 2.097. This Skew indicated that the mean was larger than the median. Also, it was not within the acceptable range of 1.0 to -1.0. The Kurtosis for *total risk 1* was 4.533. The Kurtosis indicated a leptokurtic distribution. This means that most of the values were close to the measure of central tendency. The Kurtosis was just outside of the acceptable range of 1.0 to -1.0. Given both Skew and Kurtosis issues, it was necessary to transform the data for analysis. The data was recoded into two categories, zero to one risk (N=589, 73.2%) and two to 12 risks (N=216, 26.8%).

The variable *education* was measured by asking respondents to indicate their highest level of education completed on a scale ranging from bachelor degree in progress through doctoral degree completed. There were 720 respondents who provided information pertaining to their education. The resulting data had a negative Skew of -2.605 and a Kurtosis of 8.817. Because the Skew and Kurtosis were outside of the

acceptable range of 1.0 to -1.0, it was necessary to transform the data before analysis. The data was recoded into two categories, Non-Ph.D. (N=228, 31.7%) and Ph.D (N=492, 68.3%).

The question on *gender* was answered by 714 respondents. There were 373 (52.2%) males and 341 (47.8%) females who participated in the survey.

Table 9
List of Variables (full sample), Coded for Analysis

Variable	Mean	N	Std. D.
Level of experience			
Respondent years of experience conducting research.			
Number of years			
Min = .5 Max = 60	15.7	713	12.0237
Total safety precautions			
Safety precautions utilized to reduce or eliminate risk			
Sum of safety precautions indicated			
Min = 0 Max = 14	6.59	345	2.564
Researcher's age			
Respondent age			
Number of years			
Min = 21 Max = 87	43.87	678	13.840

The variable *level of experience* was measured by asking respondents to indicate how many years of experience they have in conducting research. Information on level of experience was provided by 713 respondents. It ranged from .5 to 60 years with a mean of 15.7.

To create the variable *total safety precautions*, respondents were first asked to identify safety precautions they have utilized to reduce or eliminate risk. Then the indicated precautions were added together to obtain a total amount of safety precautions utilized by each respondent. There were 345 respondents who provided information on the types of safety precautions they have utilized. Their totals ranged from zero to 14 with a mean of 6.59.

Age was provided by 678 respondents. Ages ranged from 21 to 87 with a mean of 43.87. Next there is a presentation of the variables from the report on a research project associated with risk (Table 10).

Table 10
List of Variables (partial sample), Coded for Analysis

Variable	N	%
Data Collection Method		
Fieldwork or non-fieldwork based research methods		
Fieldwork = 1	190	63.1
Non-fieldwork = 2	19	6.3
Both = 3	92	30.6
	301	
First research		
Respondent's first research project as the primary researcher		
No = 0	130	62.2
Yes =1	79	37.8
	209	
Country		
The country where the research project was conducted		
Non-USA = 0	39	13.2
USA = 1	257	86.8
	296	
Age of population under study		
The primary age of participants under study		
Children = 1	28	9.5
Adult = 2	237	80.0
Both = 3	31	10.5
	296	
Research location		
The location for the research project		
Urban = 1	165	56.7
Suburban = 2	20	6.9
Rural = 3	34	11.7
Multiple = 4	72	24.7
	291	
Research setting		
The type of setting used during the research project		
Institutional/Professional = 1	126	42.1
Public = 2	43	14.4
Informal = 3	34	11.4
Multiple = 4	96	32.1
	299	

The variable *data collection method* was measured by asking respondents to indicate what type of data collection method (i.e., fieldwork, non-fieldwork, or both fieldwork and non-fieldwork) they employed for their research project associated with

risk. A total of 301 respondents answered this question. The fieldwork method of data collection was indicated by 190 (63.1%) respondents, non-fieldwork method of data collection was indicated by 19 (6.3%) respondents, and both methods of data collection were indicated by 92 (30.6%) respondents.

The variable *first research* was measured by first asking respondents if they were the primary researcher on the project. If they indicated yes, then they were asked if it was their first research project as the primary researcher. There were 209 respondents who answered the question on first research. Of those who answered the question, 79 (37.8%) indicated that it was their first research project as the primary researcher and 130 (62.2%) indicated that it was not their first project as the primary researcher.

The variable *country* was measured by asking respondents to identify the country where the research project associated with risk was conducted. A complete list of countries was available for selection. There were 296 respondents who answered this question. The data had a negative Skewness of -3.483 and a Kurtosis of 11.087. Because the Skew and Kurtosis were outside of the acceptable range of 1.0 to -1.0, it was necessary to transform the data before analysis. The data was collapsed into two categories, USA (N = 257, 86.8%) and Non-USA (N = 39, 13.2%).

Age of population under study was measured by asking respondents to indicate the age groups of the subjects who participated in their research project associated with risk. There were 296 respondents who provided information on whether their research participants were *young children* (below age 13), *adolescents* (age 13-17), *young adults* (age 18-24), or *adults* (age 25 and up). These four categories were not mutually exclusive. Also, there was an issue with low variance. Therefore, the data was collapsed

into three categories, Children, (N = 28, 9.5%), Adult (N = 237, 80%), and Both (N = 31, 10.5%).

To measure *research location*, respondents were asked to identify the location for their research project associated with risk. There were 291 respondents who provided information on the location for the research project. The categories offered for selection included *urban*, *suburban*, *rural*, and *other*. Respondents were provided a text box for specification of *other*, if selected. Information provided by respondent for *other* was categorized according to definitions for urban, suburban, and rural. Because respondents were able to indicate more than one category, the categories were not mutually exclusive. Therefore, as the category for *other* was resolved a fourth category for *multiple locations* was created in order to generate a variable that has mutually exclusive categories. The resulting categories were Urban (N = 165, 56.7%), Suburban (N = 20, 6.9%), Rural (N = 34, 11.7%), and Multiple (N = 72, 24.7%).

To measure *research setting*, respondents were asked to identify the setting for their research project associated with risk. There were 299 respondents who provided information on the setting for the research project. The categories offered for selection included *institutional/professional setting*, *public setting*, *informal setting*, and *other setting*. Respondents were provided a text box for specification of *other*, if selected. Information provided by respondent for *other* was categorized according to definitions for institutional/professional, public, and informal. Because respondents were able to indicate more than one category, the categories were not mutually exclusive. Therefore, as the category for *other* was resolved a fourth category for *multiple settings* was created in order to generate a variable that has mutually exclusive categories. The resulting

categories were Institutional/Professional (N = 126, 42.1%), Public (N = 43, 14.4%), Informal (N = 34, 11.4%), and Multiple (N = 96, 32.1%). Next, there is a presentation of the analysis and results for hypotheses associated with question three.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated *women are more likely than men to experience risk*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's gender and the experience of risk.* For analysis of hypothesis one the independent variable was *gender* and the dependent variable was *experience of risk*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. For *experience of risk,* yes was indicated by 136 females and 153 males and no was indicated by 205 females and 220 males. Chi-square was used for analyzing the relationship as it can assist in examining whether or not the observed frequencies are the same as the frequencies that would be found if the variables were independent of each other. In other words, Chi-square helps to determine if there is a relationship between the two variables by looking at the difference between the observed and expected frequencies. For this analysis (see Table 11), Chi-square = .095, P = .757. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *gender* and *experience of risk*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 11

Chi-square for Hypothesis One

		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total
Experience of Risk	No	220	205	425
	Yes	153	136	289
Total		373	341	714

Chi-square = .095, df = 1, p = .757

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two stated *researchers who use fieldwork as a method of data collection are more likely to experience risk than researchers who use non-fieldwork methods of data collection*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's method of data collection and the experience of risk.* For analysis of hypothesis two the independent variable was *data collection method* and the dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. It should be noted that generalizability of results for this analysis is limited because of the lack of variance in the variable *data collection method*. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 12), Chi-square = .436, P = .804. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *data collection method* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It should be noted that low variance exists within the variable categories and interpretation of the results should be taken with caution.

Table 12

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Two

		Data Collection Method			
		Fieldwork	Non-fieldwork	Both	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	56	5	30	91
	2-12	134	14	62	210
Total		190	19	92	301

Chi-square = .436, df = 2, p = .804

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three stated *young researchers are more likely than older researchers to experience risk*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's age and the experience of risk.* For analysis of hypothesis three

the independent variable was *age* and the dependent variable was *experience of risk*. *Age* was measured at the ratio level and *experience of risk* was measured at the nominal level. Since the dependent variable was a dichotomous variable Logistic Regression was used to analyze the relationship. As shown in Table 13, *age* was not a significant predictor for *experience of risk* (Wald = 2.288, p > .05) in this analysis. For this analysis, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Something to keep in mind for future research is that age was measured at present day instead of at time of risk experience. If included in the survey, this variable may have provided a different picture.

Table 13
Logistic Regression for Hypothesis Three, N = 678

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	.009	.006	2.288	1	.130	1.009
-2 Log Likelihood	916.267					
Chi-Square	2.290					
Nagelkerke R Square	.005					

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four stated *researchers conducting their first research project are likely to experience more risk than those who are not conducting their first research project*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between first research project and the amount of risk experienced*. For analysis of hypothesis four the independent variable was *first research* and the dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 14), Chi-square = .197, P = .657. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *first research* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 14

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Four

		First Research		
		No	Yes	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	31	21	52
	2-12	99	58	157
Total		130	79	209

Chi-square = .197, df = 1, p = .657

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five stated *researchers studying adolescent (age 13-17) and young adult (age 18-24) populations are more likely to experience risk than researchers studying adults (25 and up) and young children (below age 13).* The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between age of population under study and the occurrence of risk*. For analysis of hypothesis five the independent variable was *age of population* and the dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 15), Chi-square = .869, P = .648. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *age of population* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It should be noted that low variance exists within the variable categories and interpretation of these results should be taken with caution.

Table 15

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Five

		Age of Population			
		Children	Adult	Both	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	7	75	8	90
	2-12	21	162	23	206
Total		28	237	31	296

Chi-square = .869, df = 2, p = .648

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six stated *researchers with a higher level of education will experience less risk than researchers with a lower level of education*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between level of education and the occurrence of risk*. The independent variable was level of *education* (Ph.D. and non-Ph.D.). The dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both of these variables were measured at the nominal level. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 16), Chi-square = 1.132, P = .287. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *education* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Something to keep in mind for future research is that level of education was measured at present day instead of at time of risk experienced. If included in the survey, this variable may have provided a different picture.

Table 16

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Six

		Education		
		Non-Ph.D.	Ph.D.	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	170	348	518
	2-12	58	144	202
Total		228	492	720

Chi-square = 1.132, df = 1, p = .287

Hypothesis Seven

Hypothesis seven stated *researchers conducting research in an emerging/developing country will experience more risk than researchers conducting research in an economically established country*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between the research country and the experience of risk*. The independent variable was *country* (USA and non-USA) and the dependent

variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. It should be noted that generalizability of results for this analysis is limited because of the lack of variance in the variable *country*. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 17), Chi-square = .000, P = .997. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *country* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It should be noted that low variance exists within the variable categories and interpretation of these results should be taken with caution.

Table 17

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Seven

		Country		
		USA	Non-USA	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	79	12	91
	2-12	178	27	205
Total		257	39	296

Chi-square = .000, df = 1, p = .997

Hypothesis Eight

Hypothesis eight stated *researchers conducting research in an urban area are more likely to experience risk than researchers conducting research in a suburban or rural area*. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between the research location and the experience of risk*. For analysis of hypothesis eight the independent variable was *research location* and the dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 18), Chi-square = 5.280, P = .152. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *research location* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It should be noted that low

variance exists within the variable categories and interpretation of these results should be taken with caution.

Table 18

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Eight

		Research Location				
		Urban	Suburban	Rural	Multiple	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	49	9	6	25	89
	2-12	116	11	28	47	202
Total		165	20	34	72	291

Chi-square = 5.280, df = 3, p = .152

Hypothesis Nine

Hypothesis nine stated *researchers conducting research in an informal setting will experience more risk than researchers conducting research in institutional/professional, public, or other setting.* The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between the research setting and the experience of risk.* For analysis of hypothesis nine the independent variable was *research setting* and the dependent variable was *total risk 1*. Both variables were measured at the nominal level. Chi-square was used for analysis of the data. For this analysis (see Table 19), Chi-square = 1.186, P = .756. This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between *research setting* and *total risk 1*. In this case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It should be noted that low variance exists within the variable categories and interpretation of these results should be taken with caution.

Table 19

Chi-Square for Hypothesis Nine

		Research Setting				
		Institutional/Professional	Public	Informal	Multiple	Total
Total Risk 1	0-1	39	15	8	29	91
	2-12	87	28	26	67	208
Total		126	43	34	96	299

Chi-square = 1.186, df = 3, p = .756

Hypothesis Ten

Hypothesis 10 stated *male researchers with greater age, experience, and education who report use of more safety precautions experience less occurrence of risk than female researchers with less age, experience, and education who report use of less safety precautions.* The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between the experience of risks and a researcher's gender, age, level of experience, level of education, and amount of safety precautions used*. The independent variables were *age, total safety precautions, level of experience, gender,* and *education. Gender* and *education* were measured at the nominal level. *Age, total safety precautions*, and *level of experience* were measured at the ratio level. The dependent variable, *total risk 1 recode 1*, was measured at the nominal level. Because the dependent variable was dichotomous, logistic regression was used to analyze hypothesis 10. As shown in Table 20, the independent variables of *education and gender* were not significant predictors for *total risk 1* in this analysis. However, by including all of the variables in the model, *age* (Wald = 4.383, $p < .05$.), *total safety precautions* (Wald = 4.637, $p < .05$), *and level of experience* (Wald = 6.087, $p < .05$.) were significantly associated with a change in *total risk 1*. The model accounted for approximately 6.3% of the variance in *total risk1*. For this analysis, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, it should be noted that these

variables were measured at their current status. In order to accurately determine such a relationship the variables should have been assessed for a measurement at the time of the experience of risk. Based on this information it was impossible to determine that these variables were predictors of risk.

Table 20

Logistic Regression for Hypothesis 10, N = 318

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	-.035	.017	4.383	1	.036*	.965
Gender	-.331	.252	1.728	1	.189	.178
Level of Experience	.047	.019	6.087	1	.014*	1.048
Total Safety Precautions	.106	.049	4.637	1	.031*	1.111
Education Recode	.182	.290	.395	1	.530	1.200
-2 Log Likelihood	405.336					
Chi-Square	15.162					
Nagelkerke R Square	.063					

*p< .05

Hypothesis 11

Hypothesis 11 stated *researchers with a higher level of experience are likely to use more safety precautions than researchers with less experience*. Recall that a large percentage of respondents indicated that they do not use any safety precautions while some respondents reported use of as many as 14 safety precautions. This final hypothesis was developed in an attempt to understand what may have influenced the use of safety precautions. The null hypothesis was *there is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's level of experience and the amount of safety precautions utilized*. The dependent variable was *total safety precautions* and the independent variable was *level of experience*. Both variables were measured at the ratio level. Linear regression was used to analyze hypothesis 11 (see Table 21). By taking *level of experience* into

consideration only 1.6% of the variance in *total safety precautions* was accounted for in this model. The F score of 5.487 with a significance of .020 indicated that *level of experience* does have an effect on *total safety precautions*. The slope indicated that for each unit increase in *level of experience* there was a .027 unit increase in *total safety precautions* used. Though significant, this was a small increase. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 21

Linear Regression for Hypothesis 11, N = 337

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient
Level of Experience	.027*	.012	.127

F = 5.487

R^2 = .016

SE = 2.512

*p < .05

Table 22 is a summary of the results for hypotheses associated with question three.

Table 22

Results for Question Three

Hypothesis	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analysis, Sig., and Result
Ho (1) – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's gender and the experience of risk.	Gender (Nominal)	Experience of Risk (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = .095, P = .757 Fail to reject Null
Ho (2) – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's method of data collection and the experience of risk.	Data Collection (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = .436, P = .804 Fail to reject Null
Ho (3) – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's age and the experience of risk.	Researcher's Age (Ratio)	Experience of Risk (Nominal)	Logistic Regression Wald = 2.288, p > .05 Fail to reject Null

Ho (4) – There is no statistically significant correlation between first research project and the amount of risk experienced.	First research (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = .197, P = .657 Fail to reject Null
Ho (5) - There is no statistically significant correlation between age of population under study and the occurrence of risk.	Age of population under study (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = .869, P = .648 Fail to reject Null
Ho (6) - There is no statistically significant correlation between level of education and the occurrence of risk.	Education (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = 1.132, P = .287 Fail to reject Null
Ho (7) – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research country and the experience of risk.	Research country (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = .000, P = .997 Fail to reject Null
Ho (8) – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research location and the experience of risk.	Research location (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = 5.280, P = .152 Fail to reject Null
Ho (9) – There is no statistically significant correlation between the research setting and the experience of risk.	Research setting (Nominal)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Chi-square Chi-square = 1.186, P = .756 Fail to reject Null
Ho (10) – There is no statistically significant correlation between the experience of risks and a researcher's gender, age, level of experience, level of education, and amount of safety precautions used.	Gender Education (Nominal) Age Level of experience Total safety precautions (Ratio)	Total Risk 1 (Nominal)	Logistic Regression age (Wald = 4.383, $p < .05$.) safety precautions (Wald = 4.637, $p < .05$) level of experience (Wald = 6.087, $p < .05$.) Reject Null
Ho (11) – There is no statistically significant correlation between a researcher's level of experience and the amount of safety precautions utilized.	Level of experience	Total safety precautions (Ratio)	Linear Regression F = 5.487, P = .020 Reject Null

Questions Four and Five

Questions four and five pertain to the use of safety precautions. Question four was *what, if any, safety precautions do social scientists employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior?* Respondents were asked if they utilize any type of safety precaution for research. There were 758 respondents who answered this question. 415 (54.7%) respondents indicated that they do use safety precautions while 343 (45.3%) respondents indicated that they do not use safety precautions. Respondents were also asked to indicate what safety precautions they have utilized. Frequencies were reviewed for discovery of the types of precautions that are reportedly used most by researchers (see Table 23).

Table 23
Frequencies for Safety Precautions

Variable		N	%
Consider/discuss safety issues	Yes	379	92.4
	No	31	7.6
	Total	410	100.0
Risk assessment	Yes	70	17.3
	No	335	82.7
	Total	405	100.0
Strategies for boundary violations	Yes	186	47.3
	No	207	52.7
	Total	393	100.0
Established protector	Yes	114	28.7
	No	283	71.3
	Total	397	100.0
Established locator	Yes	198	50.5
	No	194	49.5
	Total	392	100.0

Developed professional/social network	Yes	264	67.3
	No	128	32.7
	Total	392	100.0
Contacted police	Yes	131	33.4
	No	261	66.6
	Total	392	100.0
Dressed for environment	Yes	322	82.1
	No	70	17.9
	Total	392	100.0
Acquired protective gear	Yes	52	13.4
	No	336	86.6
	Total	388	100.0
Established a route/make plans	Yes	195	50.1
	No	194	49.9
	Total	389	100.0
Establish emergency evacuation plan	Yes	71	18.4
	No	314	81.6
	Total	385	100.0
Telephone checks	Yes	115	30.2
	No	266	69.8
	Total	381	100.0
Strategy for ineligibles	Yes	193	51.3
	No	183	48.7
	Total	376	100.0
Set limits	Yes	261	70.2
	No	111	29.8
	Total	372	100.0

The most frequently used safety precautions were *consider or discuss possible safety issues* (92.4%), *dress for the environment* (82.1%), *set limits* (70.2%), and *develop*

a professional/social network of support (67.3%). Under the category of other safety precautions, respondents provided several precautions they use for preventing risk while conducting research. Some general themes emerged from the offered precautions that centered around the notion that researchers should take preventative precautions, follow agency policies for safety, create safety plans, develop strategies or solutions for managing situations that may occur, and complete an IRB review. A compiled list of other safety precautions was included in Appendix G

Question five was *what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior?* Respondents were asked to rate the level of success they found for the safety precautions they have used. A Likert scale was used for this question allowing respondents to rate success on a scale of *not successful at all for reducing risks* to *most successful at eliminating risks*. A scale reliability test found the Likert scale to be reliable as it produced a Cronbach's alpha of .976. Frequencies were reviewed for the rate of success given for the safety precautions identified in the previous section (see Table 24).

Table 24
Frequencies for Safety Precaution Level of Success

Variable	N	%
Set limits		
Most successful at eliminating risks	52	21.8
Very successful in reducing most risks	125	52.3
Sometimes successful in reducing some risks	51	21.3
Not very successful in reducing some risks	8	3.3
Not successful at all for reducing risks	3	1.3
Total	239	100.0
Dressed for environment		
Most successful at eliminating risks	46	15.2
Very successful in reducing most risks	129	42.6
Sometimes successful in reducing some risks	108	35.6
Not very successful in reducing some risks	13	4.3
Not successful at all for reducing risks	7	2.3
Total	303	100.0
Developed professional/social network		
Most successful at eliminating risks	38	14.8
Very successful in reducing most risks	126	49.0
Sometimes successful in reducing some risks	77	30.0
Not very successful in reducing some risks	12	4.7
Not successful at all for reducing risks	4	1.6
Total	257	100.0
Consider/discuss safety issues		
Most successful at eliminating risks	52	14.0
Very successful in reducing most risks	202	54.3
Sometimes successful in reducing some risks	105	28.2
Not very successful in reducing some risks	11	3.0
Not successful at all for reducing risks	2	.5
Total	372	100.0

The mean, median, and mode were reviewed to establish the success level of the safety precautions most reportedly used by the respondents. The four most used safety precautions were found to be *very successful* by the majority of respondents. Specifically,

consider or discuss possible safety issues received a rating of *very successful* from 54.3% of the 372 respondents who provided a rating. *Develop a professional/social network of support* received a rating of *very successful* from 49% of the 257 respondents who provided a rating for this safety precaution. *Dress for the environment* received a rating of *very successful* from 42.6% of the 303 respondents who provided a rating. *Set limits* received a rating of *very successful* from 52.3% of the 279 respondents who provided a rating for this safety precaution. It should be noted that the ratings of *not very successful* and *not successful at all* held little variation for all categories of safety precautions. This should be kept in mind when considering the results.

This chapter has reviewed types of risks associated with conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. It has identified those risks most reported by respondents. It has also reviewed safety precautions used by respondents to reduce or eliminate risks. Furthermore, the rates of success for the most used safety precautions were reviewed. This chapter also presented the results of the analysis for each hypothesis associated with risk and safety for researchers conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. The next chapter further reviews and discusses the results presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Social science disciplines have produced a large body of research in the areas of deviance, crime, and criminals. It is, therefore, logical to assume that at least a portion of these researchers have encountered danger or risk during their research. Certainly, dangers of assault, rape, robbery, arrest, harassment, verbal abuse, infection, and disease are among the possible hazards of conducting research (Van Maanen, Manning & Miller, 1995). Yet, dealing with risk has not received considerable attention by criminologists (Goldsmith, 2003).

For this dissertation, the concept of *risk* referred to the possible harm or negative consequences that may have occurred while conducting research or as a result of the research project. This included physical/health, emotional, legal, and personal/professional risks. Based on available accounts, it was clear that risk had been experienced by researchers studying social deviance and criminal behavior (Israel, 2006; Vanderstaay, 2005; Marks, 2003; Sampson & Thomas, 2003; Nilan, 2002; Scarce, 2001; Sonenschein, 2001; Westmarland, 2000; Calvey, 2000; Jamieson, 2000; Mattley, 1998; Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992; Kirby & Corzine, 1981; Hopper & Moore, 1990; Liebling, 1999; Miller, 1986). However, the extent or prevalence of such risk was unknown. It was the goal of this dissertation to contribute to the understanding of risk as experienced by those studying social deviance or criminal behavior. Quantitative methods were utilized to gather data on types of risks encountered by researchers and on safety precautions taken to reduce or eliminate risk. A discussion of that data is included in the following pages.

Research Questions One and Two

The previous chapter provided some interesting insights leading to a more in-depth understanding of the issue of risk. The first question was *what types of risk do social scientists experience when conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior?* The survey inquired about the experience of physical/health, emotional, legal, and personal/professional risks. The results of this research included a list of risks experienced by social researchers in the course of studying social deviance or criminal behavior that reflected, and extended upon, risks discovered in the literature review. From the gathered data it was seen that every option for risk included in the survey has been experienced by someone. Also, there were additional risks added to the list by the respondents. Risks included almost everything imaginable from disease and insect infestations to physical assault and emotional stress.

The second research question is *what types of risks are experienced most by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior?* While the list for possible physical/health related risk was extensive, the reviewed information indicated that a number of the respondents have not experienced physical/health related risks. Legal risks also had low occurrence within the survey. However, the categories of emotional risk and personal/professional risk were the risks experienced most. As pointed out in the previous chapter, *emotional stress*, *fear*, and *ethical dilemma* were the three most reported risks.

While the percentages were low for occurrence of physical/health and legal risks, these results hold serious implications for young researchers. For example, even though rape, shooting, and held hostage were low in occurrence, the prospect of experiencing

such risks is frightening. Dealing with these risks is compounded when a researcher is unaware of the possibility for such risk and is therefore unprepared for handling situations that may arise.

The amount of reported emotional and personal/professional risks was unexpected. This finding is relevant due to the fact that it sheds light on a topic that may often be overlooked by many individuals entering research projects on social deviance or criminal behavior. While ethical dilemmas may be discussed in some research methods courses, it is the author's belief that the emotional impact of conducting research is very much overlooked. It might be difficult to make an individual truly aware of what they may face during the course of conducting research and the impact it may have on them. Furthermore, the emotional impact of conducting research may not be realized until well into a research project. However, through education, awareness can be improved. As awareness is improved, novice researchers may become more prepared for their research experience and survive it in a healthy manner.

Research Question Three

The third question stated *are there mediating factors that affect the occurrence of risk?* This question utilized a number of hypotheses to assist in developing an understanding of factors that affect the occurrence of risk. As outlined in the previous chapter, some issues lacked of variability which limited the ability to accurately assess the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. It was also noted in the previous chapter that a number of variables were assessed long after they were experienced instead of at the time of risk occurrence. This prevented actual implications

for a relationship between the experience of risk and variables such as age and level of education.

Only in hypothesis 10 was significance achieved when attempting to establish a relationship between risk and the independent variables. In hypothesis 10, age, total safety precautions, and level of experience were found to be predictors for the experience of risk. However, as discussed earlier, these variables were measured at their current status. In order to accurately determine such a relationship the variables should have been assessed for a measurement at the time of the experience of risk. For example, at the time of risk, what was the respondent's age, level of education, and what safety precautions did they employ? It is suggested that future research on this topic collect data for the respondents' age and level of education at the time the research project associated with risk actually took place. It is also suggested that data on the utilization of safety precautions be collected in relation to projects associated with risk. This would provide better insight into the types of safety precautions that may be used to reduce certain types of risk. For example, developing a network of support may help to reduce or eliminate emotional risks.

Hypothesis 11 stated *researchers with a higher level of experience are likely to use more safety precautions than researchers with less experience*. While significance was established in the analysis of the relationship between these two variables, the actual impact seemed small. It is suggested that there are other variables that contribute to an increased use of safety precautions. However, it also seems logical that researchers with greater experience would use more safety precautions. It may be through the experience of risks that researchers begin to incorporate more safety precautions into their research.

An interesting finding came out of hypothesis one which looked at gender. No significant relationship was found between gender and the experience of risk. This was unexpected. It was especially surprising to look at the report for the risk of rape. One may expect rape to be primarily a female risk; however, this research indicates otherwise. While there were three reports for the risk of rape, two of those reports were made by male respondents.

Research Questions Four and Five

Questions four and five were *what, if any, safety precautions do social scientists employ when engaging research on social deviance or criminal behavior* and *what safety precautions do researchers judge to be the most useful to reduce or eliminate risks when researching social deviance or criminal behavior?* The most frequently used safety precautions were *consider or discuss possible safety issues* (92.4%), *dress for the environment* (82.1%), *set limits* (70.2%), and *develop a professional/social network of support* (67.3%). These safety precautions also received a rating of *very successful* for reducing or eliminating risks.

Some of the frequencies for safety precautions were surprising. For example, while 379 (92.4%) respondents indicated that they *consider or discuss possible safety issues* only 70 (17.3%) respondents reported that they *conduct a risk assessment* before engaging in research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Furthermore, only 52 (13.4%) respondents indicated that they *acquire protective gear* and 71 (18.4%) respondents reported that they *establish emergency evacuation plans*.

Surprisingly, almost half (45.3%) of the respondents indicated that they do not use safety precautions. This is troubling given that 330 (41%) respondents indicated that they

have experienced risk. This information places emphasis on the need for safety awareness and safety considerations when entering research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Based on this information it can be suggested that emphasis on the need for safety precautions may be well overlooked in research oriented university courses. Without attention given to the topic of risk and safety the experience of preventable risk will continue.

Other Limitations

This research on the experience of risk was undertaken with exploration in mind. The overarching goal was to develop a sense for the types of risks that may be encountered while researching social deviance or criminal behavior. Furthermore, it was the author's desire to develop an understanding of the types of safety precautions that may be useful in reducing or eliminating such risk. This understanding did not reach full development through the course of this research project. While types of risks were established, a true and intimate understanding of the nature of the risk experienced and strategies for prevention were not fully realized. By using the survey instrument implemented in this study, it was not possible to tie the experience of explicit risks to safety precautions specifically intended to deal with those risks. Few of the additional safety precautions offered by respondents included an explanation for the intended use of the precaution. This limitation may be overcome by future research endeavors of this kind that also include in-depth interviews with individuals who have experienced risks.

There were other limitations encountered in this dissertation. The intended population was to include both sociological and criminological organizations that would be close to equal in membership. This was not possible as several sociological

organizations limited access to their membership listings. While two large criminological organizations (American Society of Criminology and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences) were accessible to the author, only one sociological organization, the Midwest Sociological Society, granted access to their membership. They graciously provided their members with a link to the survey instrument on behalf of the author.

Response rate was also a concern. Non-response bias contributes to limits on generalizability. These limitations are recognized. As discussed earlier, there were also issues with variance. These issues made it difficult to establish absolute results.

Implications

It is recommended that researchers be proactive in their preparations for research. Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) could assist researchers by establishing protocols that include researcher safety. It is recommended that preparation for research include the utilization of safety precautions specific to the research environment. These safety precautions should include the establishment of support for dealing with emotional issues as well as ethical dilemmas that may arise during the course of research. Especially for new researchers, there should be support in place prior to beginning research on social deviance or criminal behavior.

Safety Manual

It is the intent of the author to develop a safety manual for novice researchers. This may become a reader that could be used in conjunction with a university level research methods course. In order to provide awareness, it will include a discussion of all the risks identified within this research. Some interviews will be conducted in order to provide narrative examples of how the risks play out in the research environment and to

assist the reader in developing an understanding of the personal impact created by the risk experience. The manual will also have a section on safety precautions established in this research. Not only will the reader be brought to awareness of possible risks they may face, but they must also be informed of safety techniques that can help them to manage such risk. Therefore, the manual will also include a suggested safety protocol.

A brief example of what the safety manual may include is the issue of emotional risks. A presentation of the risk possibilities would be followed by a discussion of research that may expose a researcher to such emotional risks. Examples of how emotional risk may be experienced includes: Vanderstaay's (2005) experience of what he describes as secondary trauma after one juvenile subject killed someone; Liebling's (1999), team's interviews with prisoners that were described as "harrowing" to the point of being "traumatic encounters" (p. 150); Calvey's (2000) experience of tremendous fear while walking home one evening after a particularly threatening encounter while conducting research on doormen; and researchers reviewing case records of rape victims reporting the experience of emotions similar to those reported by victims of rape (Alexander, de Chesnay, Marshall, Campbell, Johnson, & Wright, 1989).

The presentation of risk possibilities will be followed by a discussion of types of safety precautions and techniques that may be helpful to reduce or manage risk. For example, when facing the possibility for emotional risk a researcher may wish to develop a network of support prior to engaging the study. A graduate student working on a dissertation may find that a network of support could include a professional advisor, such as the chair of a dissertation committee, or a collaborative group of graduate students who debrief each day after the completion of interviews. A university professor

conducting research may find that a network of support could include colleagues in their department. Once a network of support is established it can be of great benefit for a researcher to process their emotional reactions to the research they are conducting.

While the author has plans to develop a more complete safety manual, the following is a general safety checklist that may be used before entering into research.

- Conduct a risk assessment or discuss possible safety issues with someone who can provide insight for the population under study.
- Dress for the environment.
- Set limits and boundaries for activities and conversations for which you are not willing to participate.
- Develop a professional/social network of support.
- Get to know the area where you will be working.
- Establish a route to and from the location.
- Establish an emergency evacuation plan/escape route.
- Develop a strategy for dealing with ineligible individuals.
- Establish a system to check in with a friend or colleague so that someone knows where you are at all times.

Information from this research will be developed into a safety manual that will be available to novice researchers. It is the intent of the author to bring awareness for risk that may be encountered and to provide helpful safety precautions to prevent or reduce risk.

Recommendations

From the data reviewed it is clear that risk does exist for social scientists studying social deviance and criminal behavior. It is interesting that the greatest risks reported were of an emotional and personal/professional nature. It is not clear as to the extent or rate of risk among researchers. Future research on this matter could provide such information. Now that types of risk and safety precautions are established a more detailed quantitative survey should be conducted to develop an increasingly accurate understanding of the relationship between the occurrence of risk and various other aspects of research (type of research, type of data collection, population under study, topic under study, location of study, setting of study, precautions utilized, age, level of experience, etc.).

It is suggested that a survey be conducted requesting respondents to answer the same questions based on their "most recent" research event. This would provide a current rate for the experience (or non-experience) of risk. Suggestions for future research also include surveys augmented with in-depth interviews. In-depth interviewing would allow for more personalized information to be gathered specific to risk. It would also aid in developing a deeper understanding, through case studies, of details surrounding risky research. It is further suggested that a future questionnaire utilize a more detailed checklist for risk, as well as safety precautions, based on those discovered in this study.

Summary

This dissertation began with the desire to discover types of issues that may be experienced by social scientists studying social deviance or criminal behavior. It was further decided that a beneficial goal of the research would be to establish an

understanding of safety precautions that may assist researchers in managing risky research. Through the course of the literature review it became clear that a safety manual for novice researchers is needed. The author also wanted to explore mediating factors to determine if there is some connection to the experience of risk.

While this study was successful in discovering types of risk and safety precautions that may be utilized to reduce or eliminate risk, it was not able to establish a clear link between the experience of risk and mediating factors. This leaves many areas open for exploration and continued investigation. The information on risk types and safety precautions discovered in this research will inform the development of a safety manual for novice researchers. As this study is concluded, its impact for future research is compelling. The potential for developing future knowledge and awareness only begins as this final chapter concludes.

REFERENCES

Adler, E., & Clark, R. (2008). *How It's Done: An Invitation to Social Research* (3rd ed.). California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Alexander, J., de Chesnay, M., Marshall, E., Campbell, A., Johnson, S., & Wright, R. (1989). Research note: Parallel reactions in rape victims and rape researchers. *Violence and Victims*, *4*(1), 57-62.

Austin, T. (2003). Tenting amidst terrorists: The upside of central Mindanao field work. *Practicing Anthropology*, *25*(2), 43-47.

Belousov, K., Horlick-Jones, T., Bloor, M., Gilinskiy, Y., Golbert, V., Kostikovsky, Y., Levi, M., & Pentsov, D. (2007). Any port in a storm: Fieldwork difficulties in dangerous and crisis-ridden settings. *Qualitative Research*, *7*(2), 155-175.

Blackman, S. (2007). 'Hidden ethnography': Crossing emotional borders in qualitative accounts of young people's lives. *Sociology*, *41*(4), 699–716

Bloor, M., Fincham, B., & Sampson, H. (2007). *QUALITI (NCRM) commissioned inquiry into the risk to well-being of researchers in qualitative research*. Retrieved March 28, 2011, from http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/qualiti/CIReport.pdf

Bloor, M., & Wood, F. (2006). *Keywords in Qualitative Methods: A Vocabulary of Research Concepts.* London, UK: Sage.

Brown, W., & Cook, I. (1981). The ASA at 75: Results of the 1980 Membership Survey. *The American Sociologist*, *16*(1), 81-86.

Calvey, D. (2002). Getting on the door and staying there. In G. Lee-Treweek & S. Linkogle (Eds.), *Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research* (pp. 43-60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *Frequently asked questions on certificates of confidentiality*. Retrieved March 23, 2011, from http://www.cdc.gov/od/science/integrity/confidentiality/faq_confidentiality.htm

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- and Internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*, 821-836.

De Laine, M. (2000). *Fieldwork, participation and practice: Ethics and dilemmas in qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Leeuw, E. (2008). Choosing the method of data collection. In E. de Leeuw, J. Hox, & D. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 113-135). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

De Leeuw, E., & Hox, J. (2008). Self-administered questionnaires: Mail surveys and other applications. In E. de Leeuw, J. Hox, & D. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 239-263). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

De Leeuw, E., Hox, J., & Dillman, D. (2008). The cornerstones of survey research. In E. de Leeuw, J. Hox, & D. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., & Kippen, S. (2004) Do university, ethics committees adequately protect public health researchers? *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 29*(6), 576–82.

Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: what challenges do qualitative researchers face? *Qualitative Research, 7*(3), 327–353.

Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2008). Risk to researchers in qualitative research on sensitive topics: Issues and strategies. *Qualitative Health Research, 18*(1), 133-144.

Faught, K. (2004). *Doing survey research on the internet: Yes, timing does matter*. Retrieved April 9, 2011, from http://www.allbusiness.com/marketing/market-research/914440-1.html

Florida Gulf Coast University. (2008). *Radiation safety manual*. Retrieved March 27, 2011, from http://www.fgcu.edu/orsp/compliance/radiationmanual.doc

Frost, N., Phillips, N. & Clear, T. (2007). Productivity of criminal justice scholars across the career. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(3),428-443.

Gans, H. (1962). *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans*. New York, NY: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Goldsmith, A. (2003). Fear, fumbling and frustration: Reflections on doing criminological fieldwork in Columbia. *Criminal Justice, 3*(1), 103-125.

Hamilton, M. (2009). *Online survey response rates and times*. Retrieved April 8, 2011, from http://www.supersurvey.com/papers/supersurvey_white_paper_response_rates.pdf

Holdaway, S. (1983). *Inside the British police: A force at work*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Hopper, C. B., & Moore, J. (1990). Women in outlaw motorcycle gangs. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 18,* 363-387.

Howell, N. (1988). Health and safety in the fieldwork of North American anthropologists. *Current Anthropology*, *29*(5), 780-787.

Howell, N. (1990). *Surviving fieldwork. A report of the advisory panel on health and safety in fieldwork.* Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Humphreys, L. (1968). *The tearoom trade: Impersonal sex in public places*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest dissertations & theses. (6919905).

Inciardi, J. (1993). Appendix A: Some considerations on the methods, dangers, and ethics of crack-house research. In J. Inciardi, D. Lockwood, & A. E. Pottieger (Eds.), *Women and crack-cocaine* (pp. 147-157). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Israel, T. (2006). Studying sexuality: Strategies for surviving stigma. In J. Miller & R. Tewksbury (Eds.), *Research Methods: A Qualitative Reader* (pp. 180-184). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jamieson, J. (2002). Negotiating danger in fieldwork on crime. In G. Lee-Treweek & S. Linkogle (Eds.), *Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research* (pp. 61-71). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, B., & Clarke, J. (2006). Collecting sensitive data: The impact on researchers. In J. Miller & R. Tewksbury (Eds.), *Research Methods: A Qualitative Reader* (pp. 211-226). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kenyon, E., & Hawker, S. (1999). 'Once would be enough': Some reflections on the issue of safety for lone researchers. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 2*(4), 313-327.

Kent University. (2011). *Laboratory safety, biological safety, and radiation safety*. Retrieved March 22, 2011, from http://www.dept.kent.edu/ORS/

Kinard, E. M. (1996). Conducting research on child maltreatment: Effects on researchers. *Violence and Victims*, *11*(1), 65-69.

Kirby, R., & Corzine, J. (1981). The contagion of stigma: Fieldwork among deviants. *Qualitative Sociology*, *4*(1), 3-20.

Klein, D., & Stern, C. (2004). Democrats and republicans in anthropology and sociology: How do they differ on public policy issues? *The American Sociologist*, *35*(4), 79-86.

Klein, D., & Stern, C. (2006). Sociology and classical liberalism. *The Independent Review*, *11*(1), 37-52.

Kovats-Bernat, C. (2002). Negotiating dangerous fields: Pragmatic strategies for fieldwork amid violence and terror. *American Anthropologist*, *104*(1), 1-15.

Lecocq, B. (2002). Fieldwork ain't always fun: Public and hidden discourses on fieldwork. *History in Africa*, *29*, 273-282.

Lee, R. (1995). *Dangerous fieldwork*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee-Treweek, G., & Linkogle, S. (2000). *Danger in the Field*. London, UK: Routledge.

Liebling, A. (1999). Doing research in prison: Breaking the silence? *Theoretical Criminology*, *3*(2), 147-173.

London School of Economics and Political Science. (2011). *Fieldwork*. Retrieved March 27, 2011, from http://www2.lse.ac.uk/researchStudents/Fieldwork.aspx

Lyng, S. (1990). Edgework: A social psychological analysis of voluntary risk taking. *American Journal of Sociology*, *95*(4), 851-886.

Manfreda, K., & Vehovar, V. (2008). Internet surveys. In E. de Leeuw, J. Hox, & D. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 264-284). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Marks, M. (2003). Police ethnography. *Society in Transition, 34*(1), 38-69.

Mattley, C. (1998). (Dis)Courtesy stigma: Fieldwork among phone fantasy workers. In J. Ferrell & M. Hamm (Eds.), *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance, and field research* (pp. 146-158). Boston, MA: Northeastern University.

Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Miller, E. M. (1986). *Street woman*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

Miller, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2001). *Extreme methods: Innovative approaches to social science research*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Miller, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2010). The case for edge ethnography. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 21*(4), 488-502.

Morris, R. G., & Marquart, J. W. (2010). In the classroom and on the streets: How to teach qualitative field research to criminology/criminal justice graduate students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 21(4), 526-539.

Nilan, P. (2002). 'Dangerous fieldwork' re-examined: The question of researcher subject position. *Qualitative Research, 2*(3), 363-386.

Palmquist, M. (Ed). *Ethnography*. Retrieved November 18, 2004, from http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/observe/com3a1.cfm

Paterson, B., Gregory, D., & Thorne, S. (1999). A protocol for researcher safety. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(2): 259-269.

Peritore, N. P. (1990). Reflections on dangerous fieldwork. *The American Sociologist*, *21*(4), 359-372.

Polsky, N. (1985). *Hustlers, beats and others*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Pool, E., & Regoli, R. (1984). Periodical prestige and criminal justice: An assessment of professional journals. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *2*(3), 21-29.

Price-Glynn, K. (2010). *Strip club: Gender, power, and sex work*. New York, NY and London, UK: New York University.

Punch, M. (1986). *The politics and ethics of fieldwork*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Research at Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB). Retrieved November 3, 2010 from http://www.iup.edu/irb/default.aspx

Rhodes University. (2008). *Fieldworker safety guidelines*. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from http://www.ru.ac.za/research/research/policiesandpractices/fieldworker safetyguidelines

Sampson, H., & Thomas, M. (2003). Risk and responsibility. *Qualitative Research, 3*(2), 165-189.

Scarce, R. (1994). (No) trial (but) tribulations: When courts and ethnography conflict. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 23*(2), 123-149.

Scarce, R. (2001). Scholarly ethics and courtroom antics: Where researchers stand in the eyes of the law. In M. Miller & R. Tewksbury (Eds.), *Extreme methods: Innovative approaches to social science research* (pp. 258-273). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sharp, G., & Kremer, E. (2006). The safety dance: Confronting harassment, intimidation, and violence in the field. *Sociological Methodology*, *36*, 317-327.

Shih, T., & Fan, X. (2008). Comparing response rates from web and mail surveys: A meta-analysis. *Field Methods*, *20*(3), 249–271.

Sluka, J. A. (1990). Participant observation in violent social contexts. *Human Organization*, *49*(2), 114-126.

Smallwood, S. (2002). Crossing the line. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *49*(9), A8-A10.

Sonenschein, D. (2001). On having one's research seized. In M. Miller & R. Tewksbury (Eds.), *Extreme methods: Innovative approaches to social science research* (pp. 209-215). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sorensen, J., Snell, C., & Rodriguez, J. (2006). An assessment of criminal justice and criminology journal prestige. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *17*(2), 297-322.

Tewksbury, R. (2009). Edge ethnography. In J. M. Miller (Ed.), *21st century criminology: A reference handbook* (pp. 406-412). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

University of Maryland. (2010). *Institutional review board: IRB process*. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from http://ww.umresearch.umd.edu/IRB/initialapp.html

University of Wisconsin-Madison, (2010). *Guidelines for international travel*. Retrieved March 22, 2011, from http://www.ls.wisc.edu/ors/IRB/IRB_International_Research.html

Umbach, P. D. (2004). Web surveys: Best practices. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *121*, 23-38.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2005). *Total recordable nonfatal occupational injury incidence rates, by selected industry sector, 2004*. Retrieved January 19, 2008, from http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/osh/os/osbl0010.pdf

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Van Selm, M., & Jankowski, N. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality and Quantity, 40*(3), 435-456.

Vanderstaay, S. (2005). One hundred dollars and a dead man: Ethical decision making in ethnographic fieldwork. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *34*(4), 371-409.

Venkatesh, S. (2008). *Gang leader for a day: A rogue sociologist takes to the streets.* New York, NY: Penguin.

Vitagliano, B., & Solomon, J. (2011). *Yale killing suspect admits murder, gets 44 years*. Retrieved March 30, 2011 from http://www.cnn.com/2011/CRIME/03/17/connecticut.yale.murder.plea/index.html?iref=allsearch

Westmarland, L. (2002). Taking the flak. In G. Lee-Treweek & S. Linkogle (Eds.), *Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research* (pp. 26-42). New York, NY: Routledge.

Whyte, W. F. (1981). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Williams, T., Dunlap, E., Johnson, B., & Hamid, A. (2001). Personal safety in dangerous places. In M. Miller & R. Tewksbury (Eds.), *Extreme methods: Innovative approaches to social science research* (pp. 216-238). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wright, R., Decker, S., Redfern, A., & Smith, D. (1992). A snowball's chance in Hell: Doing fieldwork with active residential burglars. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *29*(2), 148-161.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

The purpose of this study is to explore the issue of risk experienced by social researchers. For the purpose of this study, risk is defined as the possible harm or negative consequences that may occur while conducting research. There are various types of risk that will be considered, including danger to physical well-being, emotional stress or trauma, legal problems, and personal/professional issues.

1. Have you ever conducted research on social deviance or criminal behavior?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to the end of survey

In this section of questions you will be asked about times when you may have been at risk or experienced risk (possible harm or negative consequence) due to your involvement in research. This may involve risk to emotional or physical well-being, or risk of legal, personal or professional issues. Some examples of risk include the experience of arrest, stigma, ethical dilemmas, emotional stress, physical attack, or fear of physical attack.

2. Have you ever been at risk or experienced risk due to your involvement in research on social deviance or criminal behavior?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to section on Safety Precautions

Think of a time when you experienced issues, risk, or danger while conducting a research project on crime or deviance or after the project was complete. This may include a qualitative or quantitative research project for which you collected data by means of fieldwork or non-fieldwork tactics. This may even include secondary analysis of data that you did not collect yourself, but perhaps experienced issues while conducting analysis. For the next section of questions, think about your three most risky or issue-laden research projects on crime or deviance. We will go through the following questions one research project at a time. Please begin with your most risky experience first.

3. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience physical/health related issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Assault
- ❑ Held Hostage
- ❑ Rape
- ❑ Robbery
- ❑ Shooting
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No physical or health related issues were experienced during this research project

4. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience legal problems/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Arrest
- ❑ Confiscation of Research Materials
- ❑ Detainment
- ❑ Pressure to Testify
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No legal problems were experienced during this research project

5. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience emotional problems/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Depression
- ❑ Emotional Stress
- ❑ Emotional Trauma
- ❑ Fear
- ❑ Feeling Isolated
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No emotional problems were experienced during this research project

6. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience personal/professional issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Sexual Harassment
- ❑ Stigma (others negatively associate/characterize you with your research topic)
- ❑ Suspicion of Spying
- ❑ Ethical Dilemma (difficulty in making ethical decisions or maintaining ethical standards set by the social sciences)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No personal or professional issues were experienced during this research project

7. Were you the primary researcher or did you assist with research in a supportive capacity (e.g. research assistant, dissertation chair)?

- ❍ Primary researcher
- ❍ Assisted with research

If assisted with research is selected, then skip to question 9

8. Was this your first research project as the primary researcher?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

9. Did you report any of the risks you experienced during this research project?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to question 11

10. Who did you report to (e.g., program manager, dissertation chair, etc)?

11. Did you seek support for dealing with the risks you experienced?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to question 13

12. Did you find this support to be beneficial to you?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

13. What type of research methods did you employ during this research project?

- ❍ Quantitative Methods
- ❍ Qualitative Methods
- ❍ Mixed-methods (combination of quantitative and qualitative)

14. Did the research employ fieldwork (taking place outside of your home or normal place of business) or non-fieldwork based research methods for gathering data?

- ❍ Fieldwork
- ❍ Non-fieldwork
- ❍ Both

15. In what country was the research project conducted?

- ❍ United States of America
- ❍ Afghanistan
- ❍ Albania
- ❍ Algeria
- ❍ Andorra
- ❍ Angola
- ❍ Antigua and Barbuda
- ❍ Argentina
- ❍ Armenia
- ❍ Australia
- ❍ Austria
- ❍ Azerbaijan
- ❍ Bahamas
- ❍ Bahrain
- ❍ Bangladesh
- ❍ Barbados
- ❍ Belarus
- ❍ Belgium
- ❍ Belize
- ❍ Benin
- ❍ Bhutan
- ❍ Bolivia
- ❍ Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ❍ Botswana
- ❍ Brazil
- ❍ Brunei Darussalam
- ❍ Bulgaria
- ❍ Burkina Faso
- ❍ Burundi
- ❍ Cambodia
- ❍ Cameroon
- ❍ Canada
- ❍ Cape Verde
- ❍ Central African Republic
- ❍ Chad
- ❍ Chile
- ❍ China
- ❍ Colombia
- ❍ Comoros
- ❍ Congo, Republic of the...
- ❍ Costa Rica
- ❍ Côte d'Ivoire
- ❍ Croatia
- ❍ Cuba
- ❍ Cyprus

- Czech Republic
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Greece
- Grenada
- Guatemala
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Hong Kong (S.A.R.)
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran, Islamic Republic of...
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati

- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Lao People's Democratic Republic
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mexico
- Micronesia, Federated States of...
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland

- Portugal
- Qatar
- Republic of Korea
- Republic of Moldova
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Rwanda
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Tajikistan
- Thailand
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates

- ❍ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- ❍ United Republic of Tanzania
- ❍ Uruguay
- ❍ Uzbekistan
- ❍ Vanuatu
- ❍ Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of...
- ❍ Viet Nam
- ❍ Yemen
- ❍ Zambia
- ❍ Zimbabwe

16. What type of setting did you utilize for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Institutional/Professional setting (e.g., school, jail, halfway house, court, law office)
- ❑ Public setting (e.g., coffee shop, dance club, city park)
- ❑ Informal setting (e.g., home, hotel room, car)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

17. What was the location for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Urban area (large city, metropolitan area)
- ❑ Suburban area (residential community near or within commuting distance of large city)
- ❑ Rural area (small city or town, countryside, area of small population)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

18. What was the focus of your research topic (e.g., drugs, policing, child abuse, pornography, violence, etc.)?

19. What was the primary gender of your participants?
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Female
- ❍ Both male and female

20. What was the primary age of the population under study? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Young children (below age 13)
- ❑ Adolescents (age 13-17)
- ❑ Young adults (age 18-24)
- ❑ Adults (age 25 and up)

21. Have you experienced risk during another research endeavor?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to section on Safety Precautions

22. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience physical/health related issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Assault
- ❑ Held Hostage
- ❑ Rape
- ❑ Robbery
- ❑ Shooting
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No physical or health related issues were experienced during this research project

23. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience legal problems/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Arrest
- ❑ Confiscation of Research Materials
- ❑ Detainment
- ❑ Pressure to Testify
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No legal problems were experienced during this research project

24. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience emotional problems/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Depression
- ❑ Emotional Stress
- ❑ Emotional Trauma
- ❑ Fear
- ❑ Feeling Isolated
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No emotional problems were experienced during this research project

25. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience personal/professional issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Sexual Harassment
- ❑ Stigma (others negatively associate/characterize you with your research topic)
- ❑ Suspicion of Spying
- ❑ Ethical Dilemma (difficulty in making ethical decisions or maintaining ethical standards set by the social sciences)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No personal or professional issues were experienced during this research project

26. Were you the primary researcher or did you assist with research in a supportive capacity (e.g., research assistant, dissertation chair)?

- ❍ Primary researcher
- ❍ Assisted with research

If Assisted with research is selected, then skip to question 28

27. Was this your first research project as the primary researcher?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

28. Did you report any of the risks you experienced during this research project?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to question 30

29. Who did you report to (e.g., program manager, dissertation chair, etc)?

30. Did you seek support for dealing with the risks you experienced?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Is No is selected, then skip to question 32

31. Did you find this support to be beneficial to you?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

32. What type of research methods did you employ during this research project?

- ❍ Quantitative Methods
- ❍ Qualitative Methods
- ❍ Mixed-methods (combination of quantitative and qualitative)

33. Did the research employ fieldwork (taking place outside of your home or normal place of business) or non-fieldwork based research methods for gathering data?

- ❍ Fieldwork
- ❍ Non-fieldwork
- ❍ Both

34. In what country was the research project conducted?

- ❍ United States of America
- ❍ Afghanistan
- ❍ Albania
- ❍ Algeria
- ❍ Andorra
- ❍ Angola
- ❍ Antigua and Barbuda
- ❍ Argentina
- ❍ Armenia
- ❍ Australia
- ❍ Austria
- ❍ Azerbaijan
- ❍ Bahamas
- ❍ Bahrain
- ❍ Bangladesh
- ❍ Barbados
- ❍ Belarus
- ❍ Belgium
- ❍ Belize
- ❍ Benin
- ❍ Bhutan
- ❍ Bolivia
- ❍ Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ❍ Botswana
- ❍ Brazil
- ❍ Brunei Darussalam
- ❍ Bulgaria
- ❍ Burkina Faso
- ❍ Burundi
- ❍ Cambodia
- ❍ Cameroon
- ❍ Canada
- ❍ Cape Verde
- ❍ Central African Republic
- ❍ Chad
- ❍ Chile
- ❍ China
- ❍ Colombia
- ❍ Comoros
- ❍ Congo, Republic of the...
- ❍ Costa Rica
- ❍ Côte d'Ivoire
- ❍ Croatia
- ❍ Cuba
- ❍ Cyprus

- Czech Republic
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Greece
- Grenada
- Guatemala
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Hong Kong (S.A.R.)
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran, Islamic Republic of...
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati

- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Lao People's Democratic Republic
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mexico
- Micronesia, Federated States of...
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland

- Portugal
- Qatar
- Republic of Korea
- Republic of Moldova
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Rwanda
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Tajikistan
- Thailand
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates

- ❍ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- ❍ United Republic of Tanzania
- ❍ Uruguay
- ❍ Uzbekistan
- ❍ Vanuatu
- ❍ Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of...
- ❍ Viet Nam
- ❍ Yemen
- ❍ Zambia
- ❍ Zimbabwe

35. What type of setting did you utilize for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Institutional/Professional setting (e.g., school, jail, halfway house, court, law office)
- ❑ Public setting (e.g., coffee shop, dance club, city park)
- ❑ Informal setting (e.g., home, hotel room, car)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

36. What was the location for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Urban area (large city, metropolitan area)
- ❑ Suburban area (residential community near or within commuting distance of large city)
- ❑ Rural area (small city or town, countryside, area of small population)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

37. What was the focus of your research topic (e.g., drugs, policing, child abuse, pornography, violence)?

38. What was the primary gender of your participants?
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Female
- ❍ Both male and female

39. What was the primary age of the population under study? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Young children (below age 13)
- ❑ Adolescents (age 13-17)
- ❑ Young adults (age 18-24)
- ❑ Adults (age 25 and up)

40. Have you experienced risk during another research endeavor?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to section on Safety Precautions

41. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience physical/health related issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Assault
- ❑ Held Hostage
- ❑ Rape
- ❑ Robbery
- ❑ Shooting
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No physical or health related issues were experienced during this research project

42. Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience legal problems/risk such as:

- ❍ Arrest
- ❍ Confiscation of Research Materials
- ❍ Detainment
- ❍ Pressure to Testify
- ❍ Other (please specify) _____
- ❍ Other (please specify) _____
- ❍ No legal problems were experienced during this research project

43. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience emotional problems/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Depression
- ❑ Emotional Stress
- ❑ Emotional Trauma
- ❑ Fear
- ❑ Feeling Isolated
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No emotional problems were experienced during this research project

44. Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience personal/professional issues/risk such as (select all that apply):

- ❑ Sexual Harassment
- ❑ Stigma (others negatively associate/characterize you with your research topic)
- ❑ Suspicion of Spying
- ❑ Ethical Dilemma (difficulty in making ethical decisions or maintaining ethical standards set by the social sciences)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____
- ❑ No personal or professional issues were experienced during this research project

45. Were you the primary researcher or did you assist with research in a supportive capacity (e.g., research assistant, dissertation chair)?

- ❍ Primary researcher
- ❍ Assisted with research

Is Assisted with research is selected, then skip to question 47

46. Was this your first research project as the primary researcher?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

47. Did you report any of the risks you experienced during this research project?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Is No is selected, then skip to question 49

48. Who did you report to (e.g., program manager, dissertation chair, etc)?

49. Did you seek support for dealing with the risks you experienced?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Is No is selected, then skip to question 51

50. Did you find this support to be beneficial to you?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

51. What type of research methods did you employ during this research project?

- ❍ Quantitative Methods
- ❍ Qualitative Methods
- ❍ Mixed-methods (combination of quantitative and qualitative)

52. Did the research employ fieldwork (taking place outside of your home or normal place of business) or non-fieldwork based research methods for gathering data?

- ❍ Fieldwork
- ❍ Non-fieldwork
- ❍ Both

53. In what country was the research project conducted?

- ❍ United States of America
- ❍ Afghanistan
- ❍ Albania
- ❍ Algeria
- ❍ Andorra
- ❍ Angola
- ❍ Antigua and Barbuda
- ❍ Argentina
- ❍ Armenia
- ❍ Australia
- ❍ Austria
- ❍ Azerbaijan
- ❍ Bahamas
- ❍ Bahrain
- ❍ Bangladesh
- ❍ Barbados
- ❍ Belarus
- ❍ Belgium
- ❍ Belize
- ❍ Benin
- ❍ Bhutan
- ❍ Bolivia
- ❍ Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ❍ Botswana
- ❍ Brazil
- ❍ Brunei Darussalam
- ❍ Bulgaria
- ❍ Burkina Faso
- ❍ Burundi
- ❍ Cambodia
- ❍ Cameroon
- ❍ Canada
- ❍ Cape Verde
- ❍ Central African Republic
- ❍ Chad
- ❍ Chile
- ❍ China
- ❍ Colombia
- ❍ Comoros
- ❍ Congo, Republic of the...
- ❍ Costa Rica
- ❍ Côte d'Ivoire
- ❍ Croatia
- ❍ Cuba
- ❍ Cyprus

- Czech Republic
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Greece
- Grenada
- Guatemala
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Hong Kong (S.A.R.)
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran, Islamic Republic of...
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati

- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Lao People's Democratic Republic
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mexico
- Micronesia, Federated States of...
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland

- Portugal
- Qatar
- Republic of Korea
- Republic of Moldova
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Rwanda
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Tajikistan
- Thailand
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates

- ❍ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- ❍ United Republic of Tanzania
- ❍ Uruguay
- ❍ Uzbekistan
- ❍ Vanuatu
- ❍ Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of...
- ❍ Viet Nam
- ❍ Yemen
- ❍ Zambia
- ❍ Zimbabwe

54. What type of setting did you utilize for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Institutional/Professional setting (e.g., school, jail, halfway house, court, law office)
- ❑ Public setting (e.g., coffee shop, dance club, city park)
- ❑ Informal setting (e.g., home, hotel room, car)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

55. What was the location for the research project? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Urban area (large city, metropolitan area)
- ❑ Suburban area (residential community near or within commuting distance of large city)
- ❑ Rural area (small city or town, countryside, area of small population)
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

56. What was the focus of your research topic (e.g., drugs, policing, child abuse, pornography, violence)?

57. What was the primary gender of your participants?
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Female
- ❍ Both male and female

58. What was the primary age of the population under study? (select all that apply)
- ❑ Young children (below age 13)
- ❑ Adolescents (age 13-17)
- ❑ Young adults (age 18-24)
- ❑ Adults (age 25 and up)

Some researchers have found the utilization of safety measures useful when preparing to conduct research. Some examples of safety precautions include conducting a risk assessment, acquiring protective gear, establishing an emergency evacuation plan, or simply considering and discussing possible safety issues with someone.

59. Do you believe that social scientists enter into research projects fully aware of risks that may await them?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

60. Do you believe that safety issues for researchers require more attention or awareness within the social sciences?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

61. Do you utilize any type of safety precaution before the start of a research project?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Is No is selected, then skip to question 91

For the following questions, consider which safety precautions you normally take or have taken before starting a research project.

62. Have you considered or discussed possible safety issues?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

63. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

64. Have you conducted a formal risk assessment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

65. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

66. Have you identified strategies for addressing boundary violations and harassment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

67. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

68. Have you established a protector - person who ensures the researcher is safe?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

69. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

70. Have you established a locator - person who can introduce the researcher and assist with making appropriate connections?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

71. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

72. Have you developed a professional/social network of support?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

73. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

74. Have you contacted the police in the area to establish your presence as a researcher?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

75. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

76. Have you dressed specifically for the research environment?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

77. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

78. Have you acquired protective gear?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

79. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

80. Have you established a route/made plans for getting in and out of the research site?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

81. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

82. Have you established an emergency evacuation plan?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

83. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

84. Have you scheduled telephone checks before and after interviews?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

85. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

86. Have you developed a strategy for dealing with ineligible individuals wishing to participate in the research?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

87. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

88. Have you set limits on topics you are not willing to discuss or behaviors you are not willing to engage?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

89. If yes, use the following code to indicate the level of success you have found for this precaution.
- ❍ Not successful at all for reducing risks
- ❍ Not very successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Sometimes successful in reducing some risks
- ❍ Very successful in reducing most risks
- ❍ Most successful at eliminating risks

90. If you have utilized any other safety precautions, please describe them.

91. What is your age?

92. What is your gender?
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Female

93. What is the highest level of education you have achieved?
- ❍ Bachelor's degree in progress
- ❍ Bachelor's degree completed
- ❍ Master's degree in progress
- ❍ Master's degree completed
- ❍ Doctoral degree in progress
- ❍ Doctoral degree completed

94. Do you consider yourself a sociologist, criminologist, or other social scientist?
- ❍ Sociologist
- ❍ Criminologist
- ❍ Other Social Scientist (please specify) _____

95. Approximately how many years of experience do you have conducting research?

96. If you were to give advice about safety precautions to take before entering into a research project on deviance or crime, based on your experience, what would you recommend?

Appendix B

Pre-notification of Survey

Greetings!

Because of your affiliation with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and/or the American Society of Criminology, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on risk experienced by social researchers. My name is Patricia Brougham. I am a criminology doctoral student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I wish to gather information on issues experienced by both fieldwork and non-fieldwork based researchers. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Within the next couple of days, you will be receiving a link to participate in a survey for my dissertation research. You are under no obligation to participate. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

I thank you in advance for participating in this study. It means a lot to me.

Sincerely,

Patricia Brougham, Doctoral Candidate
nkxl@iup.edu or 724-357-2720
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 200
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

Timothy Austin, Ph.D., Professor
austin@iup.edu or 724-357-5609
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 104
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

Appendix C

Introduction to Survey

Greetings!

My name is Patricia Brougham. I am a criminology doctoral student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Because of your affiliation with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and/or the American Society of Criminology, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on risk experienced by social researchers. At this time, I would like to invite you to participate in an online survey on risk to the researcher. The purpose of this research endeavor is to develop an understanding of issues/risks experienced by social scientists conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Whether you have used qualitative or quantitative methods for research, your input is valuable. Your participation is purely voluntary. Your anonymity is protected as your survey responses will not be connected to your identity.

If your decision is to participate in the study, you may complete the survey at your leisure. Completion of the survey instrument indicates your consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. The survey will require approximately 20 minutes or more of your time. You may take a break at any point and return later to finish the survey. Your information will be saved, allowing you to continue the survey from where you left off. If you do choose to participate in the following survey, you may withdraw at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no penalty to you for withdrawal from the study. If your decision is to not participate in the study, you may ignore this email and disregard any future emails on this matter. You may also opt out of future emails by clicking **here**.

Follow this link to the Survey: (link will be inserted here)

This study is undertaken as partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree requirements for the criminology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. If you have any questions or wish to receive more information about this project, feel free to contact me or Dr. Timothy Austin, dissertation chair.

Thank you for participating in this study. I greatly appreciate your time and effort.

Patricia Brougham, Doctoral Candidate
nkxl@iup.edu or 724-357-2720
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 200
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

Timothy Austin, Ph.D., Professor

austin@iup.edu or 724-357-5609
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 104
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely anonymous and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.

Appendix D

Invitation to Midwest Sociological Society

Greetings!

My name is Patricia Brougham. I am a criminology doctoral student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Because of your affiliation with Midwest Sociological Society, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on risk experienced by social researchers. At this time, I would like to invite you to participate in an online survey on risk to the researcher. The purpose of this research endeavor is to develop an understanding of issues/risks experienced by social scientists conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. Your participation is purely voluntary. Your anonymity is also protected as your survey responses are not connected to your identity.

If your decision is to participate in the study, you may complete the survey at your leisure. Completion of the survey instrument indicates your consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. The survey will require approximately 20 minutes or more of your time. You may take a break at any point and return later to finish the survey. Your information will be saved, allowing you to continue the survey from where you left off. If you do choose to participate in the following survey, you may withdraw at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no penalty to you for withdrawal from the study. If your decision is to not participate in the study, you may ignore this email and disregard any future emails on this matter.

Click here (hyperlink will be inserted here). If the hyperlink does not work, you can copy and paste this link into your internet browser: link is inserted here.

This study is undertaken as partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree requirements for the criminology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. If you have any questions or wish to receive more information about this project, feel free to contact me or Dr. Timothy Austin, dissertation chair.

Thank you for participating in this study. I greatly appreciate your time and effort.

Patricia Brougham, Doctoral Candidate
nkxl@iup.edu or 724-357-2720
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 200
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

Timothy Austin, Ph.D., Professor
austin@iup.edu or 724-357-5609
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 104
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely anonymous and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.

Appendix E

Follow-up Reminder

Greetings!

This is a follow-up reminder that you are invited to participate in a study on risk to the researcher. This study is undertaken as partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree requirements for the criminology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. My name is Patricia Brougham. I am the doctoral student in charge of this study. Please, feel free to contact me with any questions regarding this study.

The purpose of this research endeavor is to explore the issue of risk experienced by social scientists conducting research on social deviance or criminal behavior. You were chosen for inclusion in this study because of your affiliation with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and/or the American Society of Criminology. Your participation is purely voluntary. Your anonymity is protected as your survey responses will not be connected to your identity.

If your decision is to participate in the study, you may complete the survey at your leisure. Completion of the survey instrument indicates your consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. Furthermore, completion of the survey instrument indicates your understanding of the information presented in this email. The survey will require approximately 20 minutes or more of your time. If you do choose to participate in the following survey, you may withdraw at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no penalty to you for withdrawal from the study. If your decision is to not participate in the study, you may ignore this email and disregard any future emails on this matter. You may also opt out of future emails by clicking **here**.

Follow this link to the Survey: (link will be inserted here)

If you have any questions or wish to receive more information about this project, feel free to contact me or Dr. Timothy Austin, dissertation chair.

Thank you for participating in this study. I greatly appreciate your time and effort.

Patricia Brougham, Doctoral Candidate
nkxl@iup.edu
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 200
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

Timothy Austin, Ph.D., Professor
austin@iup.edu or 724-357-5609

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 104
411 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.

Appendix F

Variables

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
At risk or experienced risk	2	Have you ever been at risk or experienced risk due to your involvement in research on social deviance or criminal behavior?	Yes No	Nominal
Total risks experienced	3-6 22-25 41-44	Total count of all risks identified within these survey items.	3, 22, 41 – physical risks 4, 23, 42 – legal risks 5, 24, 43 – emotional risks 6, 25, 44 – personal/professional risks	ratio
Total physical risks per project	3, 22, 41	Total count of all physical risks identified within these survey items	Total physical risks identified in Project 1 Project 2 Project 3	Ratio
Total legal risks per project	4, 23, 42	Total count of all legal risks identified within these survey items	Total legal risks identified in Project 1 Project 2 Project 3	Ratio
Total emotional risks per project	5, 24, 43	Total count of all emotional risks identified within these survey items	Total emotional risks identified in Project 1 Project 2 Project 3	Ratio
Total personal/professional risks per project	6, 25, 44	Total count of all personal/professional risks identified within these survey items	Total personal/professional risks identified in Project 1 Project 2 Project 3	Ratio
Total risks per project	3-6 22-25 41-44	Total count of risk reported for each separate project	Total risk experienced during Project 1 Project 2 Project 3	Ratio
Physical risk – assault	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical**/**health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Physical risk – disease	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical**/**health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Physical risk – rape	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical**/**health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
Physical risk – robbery	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical/health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Physical risk – perceived physical risk	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical/health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
No physical risk	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical/health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Physical risk – other	3, 22, 41	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **physical/health** related issues/risk such as:	Yes No Narrative answer will be coded later as new risk variables	Nominal
Legal risk – arrest	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Legal risk – Confiscation	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Legal risk – Detainment	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Legal risk – Pressure to testify	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Legal risk – Other	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No Narrative answer will be coded later as new risk variables	Nominal
No legal risk	4, 23, 42	Due to your involvement with this research project, did you experience **legal** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Emotional risk - depression	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Emotional risk – emotional stress	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
Emotional risk – emotional trauma	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Emotional risk - fear	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Emotional risk – other	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No Narrative answer will be coded later as new risk variables	Nominal
No emotional risk	5, 24, 43	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **emotional** problems/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Personal/professional risk – stigma	6, 25, 44	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **personal/professional** issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Personal/professional risk – ethical dilemma	6, 25, 44	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **personal/professional** issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Personal/professional risk – other	6, 25, 44	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **personal/professional** issues/risk such as:	Yes No Narrative answer will be coded later as new risk variables	Nominal
No personal/professional risk	6, 25, 44	Due to your involvement with this research project did you experience **personal/professional** issues/risk such as:	Yes No	Nominal
Researcher role	7, 26, 45	Were you the primary researcher or did you assist with research in a supportive capacity (i.e. research assistant, dissertation chair)?	Primary researcher Assisted with research	Nominal
First research	8, 27, 46	Was this your first research project as the primary researcher?	Yes No	Nominal
Report risks experienced	9, 28, 47	Did you report any of the risks you experienced during this research project?	Yes No	Nominal
Who report risks to	10, 29, 48	Who did you report to?	Narrative box	Nominal

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
Seek support	11, 30, 49	Did you seek support for dealing with the risks you experienced?	Yes No	Nominal
Support beneficial	12, 31, 50	Did you find this support to be beneficial to you?	Yes No	Nominal
Research methods	13, 32, 51	What type of research methods did you employ during this research project?	Quantitative methods Qualitative methods Mixed-methods	Nominal
Method for data gathering	14, 33, 52	Did the research employ fieldwork (taking place outside of your home or normal place of business) or non-fieldwork based research methods for gathering data?	Fieldwork Non-fieldwork Both	Nominal
Research country	15, 34, 53	In what country was the research project conducted?	Pop-up menu of all countries	Nominal
Research setting	16, 35, 54	In what type of setting did you experience risk during the research project?	Institutional/Professional setting Public setting Informal setting Other (narrative box)	Nominal
Research location	17, 36, 55	What was the location for the research project?	Urban area Suburban area Rural area Other (narrative box)	Nominal
Research focus	18, 37, 56	What was the focus of your research topic (i.e., drugs, policing, child abuse, pornography, violence)?	Narrative box	Nominal
Gender of population under study	19, 38, 57	What was the primary gender of your participants?	Male Female Both male and female	Nominal
Age of population under study	20, 39, 58	What was the primary age of your participants?	Young children (below age 13) Adolescents (age 13-17) Young adults (age 18-24) Adults (age 25 and up) All ages	Nominal
Belief that researchers are aware of risks	59	Do you believe that social scientists enter into research projects fully aware of risks that may await them?	Yes No	Nominal
Belief that safety issues requires more attention	60	Do you believe that safety issues for researchers require more attention or awareness within the social sciences?	Yes No	Nominal
Utilize safety precautions	61	Do you utilize any type of safety precaution before the start of a research project?	Yes No	Nominal

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
Total safety precautions used	62-76	Total count of all safety precautions indicated as used within survey items 62-76.	In survey items 62-76, total indicated yes for safety items used.	ratio
Consider possible safety issues	62	Do you consider or discuss possible safety issues?	Yes No	Nominal
Risk assessment	63	Do you conduct a formal risk assessment?	Yes No	Nominal
Strategies for boundary violations and harassment	64	Do you identify strategies for addressing boundary violations and harassment?	Yes No	Nominal
Protector	65	Do you establish a protector - person who ensures the researcher is safe?	Yes No	Nominal
Locator	66	Do you establish a locator - person who can introduce the researcher and assist with making appropriate connections?	Yes No	Nominal
Network of support	67	Do you develop a professional/social network of support?	Yes No	Nominal
Contact police	68	Do you contact the police in the area to establish presence as a researcher?	Yes No	Nominal
Dress for environment	69	Do you dress for the environment?	Yes No	Nominal
Protective gear	70	Do you acquire protective gear?	Yes No	Nominal
Plans for getting in and out	71	Do you establish a route/make plans for getting in and out of the research site?	Yes No	Nominal
Emergency evacuation plan	72	Do you establish an emergency evacuation plan?	Yes No	Nominal
Telephone checks	73	Do you schedule telephone checks before and after interviews?	Yes No	Nominal
Strategy for dealing with ineligibles	74	Do you develop strategy for dealing with ineligible individuals wishing to participate in the research?	Yes No	Nominal
Set limits	75	Do you set limits on topics you are willing to discuss or behaviors you are willing to engage?	Yes No	Nominal
Other safety precautions	76	If you have utilized any other safety precautions, please describe them?	Narrative box	Nominal

Variable	Survey item	Measurement	Response categories	Level of measurement
Rate success of precautions used	62-76	Pop-up scale for each safety precaution indicated. This will give us an idea of the level of success for each precaution used. From that we can determine the best safety precautions to recommend for future use.	1. Not successful at all for reducing risks 2. Not sure if successful in reducing some risks 3. Sometimes successful in reducing some risks 4. Very successful in reducing most risks 5. Most successful at eliminating risks	Ordinal
Researcher's age	77	What is your age?	Age in years	Ratio
Researcher's gender	78	What is your gender?	Male Female	Nominal
Education	79	What is the highest level of education you have achieved?	Bachelor's degree in progress Bachelor's degree completed Master's degree in progress Master's degree completed Doctoral degree in progress Doctoral degree completed	Ordinal
Discipline	80	Do you consider yourself primarily a sociologist or criminologist?	Sociologist Criminologist Other (narrative box)	Nominal
Level of experience	81	Approximately how many years of experience do you have conducting research?	Years	Ratio
Recommendations	82	If you were to give advice about things to do before entering into a research project on deviance or crime, based on your experience, what would you recommend?	Narrative box	Nominal

Appendix G

Additional Safety Precautions

- Use common sense, intuition and situational awareness.
- Discuss the nature of research, emotional nature of questions and possible reactions to those questions.
- Follow agency policies for safety and complete an IRB review.
- Take preventative precautions, create safety plans, and develop strategies or solutions for dealing with situations that may occur.
- Ensure that there is adequate supervision in the field.
- Get training on procedures for handling uncomfortable or dangerous situations.
- Have a legal team on alert.
- Avoid disclosing personal information, keep private and professional life separate, install security system at residence, and put gates on driveway.
- Prescreen subjects.
- Check police calls for service to screen out potentially unsafe residences when sampling for household surveys.
- Do not consume drugs or alcohol and carry little cash.
- Do not go into a respondent's house.
- When inside, keep your back to the door to ensure access to exits.
- Conduct research in teams and debrief with team at the end of each day.
- Carry a cell phone and make sure it is charged before going into the field.
- Make sure there is cell phone service in the research location.
- Have emergency contacts and the local police phone number.
- Treat participants with respect, openness, and honesty.
- Have empathy with the subjects.
- Use "cool-out sessions" at the end of interviews.
- Have full awareness of the environment.
- Investigate area, ensure environment is safe.
- Use a neutral location, public location, or formal setting.
- Get to know the scene and players.
- Establish contact with subject early and explain research process.
- Consider the time of day when conducting research.
- Only conduct research during daylight hours.
- Utilize a gatekeeper or employ a local or insider to provide security.
- Utilize probation officers, police officers, or correction officers as escorts or extra security.
- Make contact with embassy upon arrival in foreign country.
- Eliminate identifiers quickly to protect subject.
- Secure data (physically and electronically) and use encryption software.
- Make sure consent forms are signed.
- Obtain medications, immunizations, and knowledge of infectious disease.

- In hot weather, provide a variety of beverages in an ice chest to prevent health problems related to heat.
- Create business cards and identification badges for interviewers.
- Put a university decal or logo on the back of clipboards used for conducting research.