



**Ethnographic research on crime and control: Editors' introduction**

Journal:	<i>Methodological Innovations</i>
Manuscript ID	MIO-17-0010
Manuscript Type:	SI: Doing ethnography on crime and control
Keywords:	ethnography, criminology, criminal justice, reflexivity
Abstract:	Jennifer Fleetwood and Gary R. Potter introduce a special section on ethnographic research on crime and control.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Ethnography has a special place in the history of criminology and the sociology  
6 of deviance. Whilst other methodological approaches may be more widely employed,  
7 commitment to prolonged presence, and sometimes participation, undoubtedly  
8 generates rich data and theoretical insight. Many of the most successful theories and  
9 perspectives within criminology (strain, sub-cultural theories, differential association,  
10 labelling, etc.) have emerged unashamedly from ethnographic research, and many of the  
11 biggest names in criminology have been ethnographers for at least part of their  
12 research careers.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Ethnographic research is particularly suited to studying crime, control and  
24 victimisation. Given that crime has no ontological reality (Hillyard and Tombs, 2004),  
25 positivist approaches – in isolation – seem doomed to fail. Quantitative research,  
26 including criminal justice statistics, are a mainstay of criminological research, but  
27 ethnography is uniquely able to get under the skin of the phenomenological draws of  
28 crime and control, and the corporeal realities of victimisation. Ethnographic methods –  
29 that is, prolonged presence, observation, and perhaps participation and interviews –  
30 allow us to explore the relationships between crime and control; to see the world from  
31 the perspective of those we seek to study; and to understand the broader social and  
32 cultural milieu in which such behaviours – and state responses to them – manifest. To  
33 paraphrase Oscar Wilde, overreliance on uncritical positivist approaches that seek only  
34 to *measure* behaviours may allow us to count everything, but risk revealing the value of  
35 nothing. Qualitative methods help reverse this bias, prioritising understanding over  
36 measurement.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 But beyond this, ethnographies can inspire. They are the books we proudly  
56 display in our offices (having actually read them); the ones we pack for long journeys,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 read in hospital waiting rooms, or take on holiday (when we're supposed to be having a  
4  
5 break from work...). By weaving together history, biography and culture, and shedding  
6  
7 light on the everyday good, ethnography enthuses researchers and their audiences –  
8  
9 students, fellow academics, practitioners and the general public – with its ability to  
10  
11 contribute both depth and breadth to our knowledge of groups who are often  
12  
13 marginalised, and poorly understood. Making the alien, strange or threatening  
14  
15 comprehensible has long been a strength of ethnographic research; a task that remains  
16  
17 vital in the contemporary context of global, social and cultural division.  
18  
19

20  
21 Ethnographic research on crime and control is arguably undergoing a period of  
22  
23 unprecedented creativity and vitality, influenced in part by the emergence of cultural  
24  
25 criminology in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century (Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2015), and ultra  
26  
27 realism in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century (Hall and Winlow 2015). Ethnography has once again  
28  
29 been centrally situated within critical and radical criminological traditions pitched now,  
30  
31 as previously, as an essential counter-point to the quantitative methods of the positivist  
32  
33 approaches that have come to dominate a 'mainstream' criminology seeking to position  
34  
35 itself as 'scientific' in its approach (see, e.g. Young, 2011; Hall and Winlow, 2016).  
36  
37 Although cultural criminology never advocated exclusively for ethnography, as a holistic  
38  
39 method it is nonetheless well placed to appreciate the subjective, sensual aspects of  
40  
41 crime (Ferrell 1997). And although Wacquant (2002) claimed that prison ethnography  
42  
43 was in 'eclipse', the preponderance of PhD students researching 'under the radar' in  
44  
45 prisons– and other criminal justice institutions – says otherwise (Jewkes 2016).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 Yet, it has long been stated that ethnography is under threat as a major research  
54  
55 approach in contemporary criminology, caught between the dual pressures of demands  
56  
57 for output (increasingly measured – that positivist word again – by number of  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 publications, citations and impact) and research governance (including ethics  
4  
5 procedures and risk assessments) (Hall and Winlow 2012; Adler and Adler 1998).  
6  
7 Ethnography doesn't always fit with the former demand, dependant on extensive  
8  
9 periods of fieldwork, lending itself to publication in book form rather than as multiple  
10  
11 journal articles, and often (but by no means always) producing findings that may appear  
12  
13 to be limited in their generalisability (when set against the yard-sticks of positive  
14  
15 methods – which of course entirely misses the point of ethnography) due to engaging  
16  
17 with small and unrepresentative samples. And criminological ethnography can be  
18  
19 controversial – researchers' engagement with criminals and knowledge of (and, at  
20  
21 times, participation in) illegal behaviour throws up ethical questions, and examples  
22  
23 exist of ethnographers who have maybe gone too far. Academic institutions, like so  
24  
25 many other bodies, are increasingly risk-averse and may wish to avoid the publicity and  
26  
27 scrutiny that goes with examples like Alice Goffman (accused firstly of participating in  
28  
29 serious crime and then of making up data), Bradley Garrett (arrested and prosecuted  
30  
31 for committing crimes with his research subjects), Laud Humphreys (whose work on  
32  
33 the 'Tearoom Trade' (1975) features as a core text on so many ethics courses) or Rik  
34  
35 Scarce (who served prison time for refusing to share the contact details of his  
36  
37 respondents with law enforcement). Although our counterparts in the USA predicted  
38  
39 that the institutional ethical governance of research was a death knell for ethnography  
40  
41 or 'risky' research (Haggerty 2004), PhD students, supervisors and researchers have  
42  
43 nonetheless managed to defend their research and soldier on.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Against the background of increased teaching and administration-related work  
54  
55 loads, finding the time, freedom and institutional support to engage with ethnographic  
56  
57 research is undoubtedly difficult for most academic criminologists. Yet in the  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 challenging times of late- (high-, post-, reflexive-, liquid-) modernity, where the nature  
4  
5 of both deviance itself and responses thereto seem to be constantly – and rapidly –  
6  
7 changing alongside broader changes in society, culture and communication, the insights  
8  
9 gained from the immersive nature of ethnography are perhaps more important than  
10  
11 ever. Fortunately, ethnographic research in British criminology is alive and well – and  
12  
13 while PhD researchers (who have the time and freedom to engage in sustained, in-depth  
14  
15 fieldwork) may dominate this area, ethnography is also employed by many research-  
16  
17 active criminologists both within and beyond academia . We present this special section  
18  
19 to celebrate and support criminological ethnographers out there – and to encourage  
20  
21 other, would-be ethnographers to follow suit. But we also hope to demonstrate the  
22  
23 importance and utility of ethnography within the criminological endeavour – and to  
24  
25 encourage fellow academics, managers and departmental heads, and funders and policy  
26  
27 makers to actively support ethnography in spite of the current academic climate.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **The special section**

36  
37 The special section we present here emerged from a Symposium on ‘Doing  
38  
39 Ethnographic research on Crime and Control’, held at the University of Leicester in May  
40  
41 2015 (more below). It brings together articles by emergent UK ethnographers  
42  
43 undertaking ethnographic research on crime, control and victimisation.  
44  
45

46  
47 The continuing success of ethnography owes much to a long-standing tradition  
48  
49 of reflective practice: offering detailed confessionals and personal accounts on the  
50  
51 myriad issues encountered in the field and beyond. Researching crime and control is at  
52  
53 times particularly tricky: ethical and legal issues abound. Although good accounts in  
54  
55 print do exist (for example, Hobbs and May, 1993), researchers have reputations to  
56  
57 build, or protect, and so narrative accounts of fieldwork demand a productive  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 resolution. That is to say, published accounts almost always have a happy – or, at least, a  
4  
5 definite – ending whereas in reality fieldwork tends to leave loose ends all over the  
6  
7 place. These realities of ethnographic field research are often discussed in the corridors  
8  
9 of universities, or in the pub at conferences. These informal discussions have different  
10  
11 rules: there is less need to present the job as finished, or even as well done. Mistakes  
12  
13 can be discussed and solutions mulled over together. These kinds of discussions can  
14  
15 also subvert hierarchies: after all, with some exceptions, PhD students tend to be closer  
16  
17 to the field, lending them a vivid connection to fieldwork that office-bound academics  
18  
19 lack. The main problem with such discussions is that there is never enough time.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The Symposium, snappily titled “Doing Ethnographic Research on Crime and  
25  
26 Control” was dreamt up to give space to these important discussions. It gathered  
27  
28 momentum, especially when Professors Peter and Patricia Adler agreed to come to the  
29  
30 UK and join in (not just as keynote speakers, but as active participants throughout), and  
31  
32 when Professor Yvonne Jewkes and Dr James Treadwell agreed to give plenary papers –  
33  
34 together representing the dual themes of research on crime (James) and control  
35  
36 (Yvonne). Word of the symposium spread, and a team of fantastic ethnographers  
37  
38 committed to attending and participating, including enthusiastically agreeing to some  
39  
40 unorthodox requests (more below). Of course, none of the above could have happened  
41  
42 without the financial backing of the University of Leicester, and in particular the  
43  
44 support of Professors John Goodwin and Adrian Beck who committed last minute  
45  
46 funding that meant that the symposium could be free.  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 In order to reflect the free-wheeling nature of pub-based conversations strict  
52  
53 rules were needed. Aside from plenaries, most of the symposium was composed of  
54  
55 parallel sessions foregrounding discussion rather than quiet listening. Speakers had just  
56  
57 10 minutes to reflect on the topic at hand; literature reviews and powerpoint/prezzi  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were banned. Speakers were given license to pose questions (rather than answers) and  
4  
5 to speak to the personal as well as professional aspects of fieldwork. The Chatham  
6  
7 House rule was adopted to encourage open and honest debate. Sessions included  
8  
9 reflections on the role of the researcher's body and emotions in research, lively  
10  
11 discussions about ethics and legal issues, and negotiating access to criminal justice  
12  
13 institutions, drawing on a diverse array of research topics from computer hacking to  
14  
15 parkour, policing and probation culture, festivals and protests. Chairs were under strict  
16  
17 instruction to encourage everyone to participate regardless of formal academic status.  
18  
19 The success of the event owes much to presenters who dared to leave the safety of  
20  
21 rehearsed scripts, chairs who set the tone for discussion, and participants for their  
22  
23 thoughtful, honest and enthusiastic participation in discussion. In particular, Patti and  
24  
25 Pete were fantastic contributors who shared their extensive knowledge without making  
26  
27 the rest of us feel naïve: their plenary 'The FAQs of Ethnography on Crime and Deviance:  
28  
29 What Everyone Wants to Know But is Afraid to Ask' offered a rare peek behind the  
30  
31 scenes at the craft, as honed over decades of experience.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Translating the spirit of the symposium into print has not been easy. Bluntly put:  
38  
39 the kinds of things that could be said in the safe confines of the symposium pose  
40  
41 problems for journal editors and authors alike – and the majority of contributors and  
42  
43 contributions to the symposium did not translate into articles. As a result, some  
44  
45 submissions are missing. Of course, we are duty bound not to discuss the whys and  
46  
47 wherefores, but some of the issues extend beyond single submissions so perhaps we  
48  
49 can say something in more general terms. The legal (and indeed public) risks run by  
50  
51 ethnographers were an important theme of discussion at the conference – most well  
52  
53 known being Alice Goffman and Bradley Garrett. These cases (and others similarly) say  
54  
55 much about the contemporary nature of ethnography and also stimulate important  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 debates about our professional practice. Nonetheless, translating them onto the page,  
4  
5 and out of the context of our professional 'huddle,' proves complex work indeed. Frank  
6  
7 discussion between ethnographers about our craft is vital, but becomes hugely more  
8  
9 complex when the 'audience' includes any number of unknown 'others'. A second theme  
10  
11 that turned up as we reviewed papers was how much of the researcher's 'self' to reveal.  
12  
13 This is not a new debate (Jewkes 2012), but it was especially salient since many  
14  
15 contributors – both to this special section and the parent symposium – are emerging  
16  
17 scholars for whom the costs of identifying oneself as deviant, or even as deviant-  
18  
19 sympathetic, may come at a high cost. Whilst criminologists might value insider status  
20  
21 and even deviant experiences, to the lay audience, these same experiences likely  
22  
23 undermine our objectivity and credibility. Whilst these hurdles have been difficult to  
24  
25 manage, arguably they confirm the importance of the symposium itself – there is no  
26  
27 substitute for being together to spark discussion. Nonetheless, the following  
28  
29 contributions offer fascinating insights into the challenges that dedicated, in-depth  
30  
31 fieldwork generates. The papers we present here illustrate methodological innovations  
32  
33 while reflecting on practical, ethical and personal challenges inherent in many  
34  
35 ethnographies, but not always so openly or reflexively discussed in print.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 In our opening paper, Hannah Thurston discusses her ethnography of  
43  
44 punishment museums in Texas, advocating strongly not only for the museum as an  
45  
46 ethnographic site, but also for the importance of reflecting on personal emotions as  
47  
48 museum visitor/researcher and as observer of other visitors and staff as she and they  
49  
50 interact with the artefacts and architecture of what is both an educational and a tourist  
51  
52 institution. In a similar vein, but dramatically different context, Deidre Ruane reports on  
53  
54 conducting research into drug use at music festivals and combining the roles of support  
55  
56 worker, researcher and festival participant – reflecting on how these sometimes  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 competing, sometimes complementary identities both demand innovative methods and  
4  
5 generate novel empirical and theoretical insights. Irene Zempi also focuses on the  
6  
7 relationship between researcher identity and emotion, and participatory methods as  
8  
9 she discusses her decision to adopt a (partial) insider status by donning the veil in her  
10  
11 research into Islamophobic victimisation. She explores the ethical dilemma of such an  
12  
13 approach (which flirts with problems of deceit and of cultural appropriation), and the  
14  
15 emotional challenges relating to her own experiences of victimisation while adopting  
16  
17 the identity of her research subjects – and reflects on both the personal and academic  
18  
19 aspects of this experience.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Gary Potter's contribution moves away from the personal reflexivity of the first  
25  
26 three papers, but continues the theme of methodological innovation in ethnography.  
27  
28 Drawing on over 15 years of experience researching cannabis cultivation, his discussion  
29  
30 of the role of – and interplay between – online and offline ethnographic approaches  
31  
32 provides an important lesson for the contemporary era: as aspects of criminality (like  
33  
34 all other forms of social interaction) increasingly straddle both the 'real' and 'virtual'  
35  
36 worlds (and as the distinction between the two becomes increasingly artificial), so  
37  
38 ethnographic research much integrate on- and offline approaches rather than  
39  
40 prioritising either over the other.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Changing focus again, Tracey Elliott and Jennifer Fleetwood conclude the  
46  
47 collection with a discussion on the legal risks related to criminological ethnography.  
48  
49 Combining Elliott's legal with Fleetwood's ethnographic expertise, they tackle the  
50  
51 problem of 'guilty knowledge' – of receiving information about, or even directly  
52  
53 witnessing, criminal activity during fieldwork. It is likely some relief to many of us  
54  
55 working in this tradition to know the limits of the law here (there is no default duty to  
56  
57 report crimes we find out about during research, at least under UK law), which may  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 help us (in part, if not entirely) to deal with some of the ethical dilemma's inherent in  
4  
5 criminological ethnography.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 10 **Postscript: Future of the symposium**

11  
12 In 2016, we met at the University of Birmingham for a second Symposium on  
13  
14 Ethnographic Research for Crime and Control. Newcomers Professor Dick Hobbs, and  
15  
16 Dr Ben Crewe, as well as a returning Yvonne Jewkes, gave inspiring plenaries. As  
17  
18 previously, we were struck by the vibrancy of ethnographic research in the UK. Panel  
19  
20 discussions were wide ranging: as before, ethical dilemmas abounded and questions of  
21  
22 how much of the researcher to reveal and conceal in writing up were writ large. Again,  
23  
24 we were enthralled by the very wide range of research topics from wildlife crimes to  
25  
26 'violent' sports, and ethnographic research in institutions as diverse as prisons and  
27  
28 children's homes. In 2017 we are taking a break, but plan to return in 2018. It is hoped  
29  
30 that the symposium continues to cultivate expertise on ethnographic research, as well  
31  
32 as offering support for participants in their endeavours in the field and in print. In this  
33  
34 same spirit, we are proud to be bringing these papers to a wider audience via  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 *Methodological Innovations*.

### 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 **References**

51  
52 Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1998) 'Foreword: Moving backward.' In J. Ferrell & M. S. Hamm  
53  
54 (eds.), *Ethnography at the edge: crime, deviance, and field research*. London:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Northeastern University Press.

- 1  
2  
3 Ferrell, J. (1997) 'Criminological verstehen: Inside the immediacy of crime.' *Justice*  
4  
5 *Quarterly* 14(1): 3-23.  
6  
7  
8 Ferrell, J., Hayward, K., & Young, J. (2015) *Cultural Criminology: An Invitation*. London:  
9  
10 Sage.  
11  
12 Haggerty, K. D. (2004). 'Ethics creep: Governing social science research in the name of  
13  
14 ethics.' *Qualitative Sociology* 27(4), 391-414.  
15  
16  
17 Hall, S. & Winlow, S. (2012) 'The Need for "New Directions" in Criminological Theory'. In  
18  
19 S. Hall & S. Winlow (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Routledge.  
20  
21 Hall, S. & Winlow, S. (2015) *Revitalizing Criminological Theory: Towards a New Ultra-*  
22  
23 *Realism*. London: Routledge.  
24  
25  
26 Hall, S. & Winlow, S. (2016). "'Keeping It Real": Dick Hobbs' Legacy of Classic  
27  
28 Ethnography and the New Ultra-realist Agenda.' In G. Antonopoulos (ed.) *Illegal*  
29  
30 *Entrepreneurship, Organized Crime and Social Control*. London: Springer International  
31  
32 Publishing.  
33  
34  
35 Hillyard, P. & Tombs, S. (2004) 'Beyond criminology?' In P. Hillyard, C. Pantazis, S.  
36  
37 Tombs & D. Gordon (eds.) *Beyond criminology: Taking harm seriously*. London: Pluto  
38  
39 Press.  
40  
41  
42 Hobbs, D. (2013) *Lush life: Constructing organised crime in the UK*. Oxford: Clarendon  
43  
44 Press.  
45  
46 Hobbs, D. & May, T. (eds.) (1993). *Interpreting the field*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
47  
48  
49 Humphreys, L. (1975) *Tearoom trade: Impersonal sex in public places (enlarged edition)*.  
50  
51 Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.  
52  
53 Jewkes, Y. (2012). 'Autoethnography and emotion as intellectual resources: Doing  
54  
55 prison research differently.' *Qualitative Inquiry* 18(1), 63-75.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Jewkes, Y. (2016) 'Foreword'. In D.H. Drake, R., Earle & J. Sloan (eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of prison ethnography*. Springer.

Wacquant, L. (2002) 'The Curious Eclipse of Prison Ethnography in the Age of Mass Incarceration'. *Ethnography* 3(4): 371-397.

For Peer Review