




9

The Sex Work and Sexual Violence Study: Research Methods

Teela Sanders , Susie Balderston , Chris Wakefield ,
Jane Scoular , Barbara G. Brents , and Gillian Abel 

Introduction

This chapter summarises the values and methodology for the mixed methods, international research from which the data used in this book were drawn.

The Sex Work and Sexual Violence project is described extensively in the project protocol (Scoular et al., 2023). Protocols (cf. Pemberton

T. Sanders (✉)

University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

e-mail: teela.sanders@leicester.ac.uk

S. Balderston · J. Scoular

Strathclyde Law School, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

e-mail: jane.scoular@strath.ac.uk

C. Wakefield

Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington, USA

B. G. Brents

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA

e-mail: barb.brents@unlv.edu

© The Author(s) 2025

T. Sanders et al. (eds.), *Voicing Consent*, Palgrave Advances in Sex Work Studies,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-77715-8_9

et al., 2021) are increasingly adopted in the social sciences, particularly because they help to ensure consistent standards and quality across multiple research sites, as well as transparency in large studies. The protocol describes the eligibility of the participants, the length of the study, anticipated ethical concerns, and details around data storage and methods of analysis in the study. The research was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (ES/V002465/1).

Mixed Methods Research

The study began in July 2021 and data collection took place over a 12-month period, from March 2022 to March 2023. The mixed research methods in this study included:

- thematic literature reviews, to produce a contemporary knowledge base on the themes of the project and to inform research design;
- an academic advisory board, project steering group, and advisory groups of key academic, sex worker, and NGO advisers in the UK, USA, and Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ), to provide oversight and assistance at key stages, including in the recruitment of participants, and to guide the research in ensuring ethical, transparent engagement and delivery;
- an expert peer research group with lived experience of sex work and/or sexual violence, who were involved in designing the survey and interview schedules, prioritising recommendations, writing up, and disseminating findings;
- an action learning set, which helped ensure equal and participatory action learning with the team throughout the project;

G. Abel

University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

e-mail: gillian.abel@otago.ac.nz

- qualitative interviews in each research site with sex workers, practitioners, and criminal justice system professionals;
- an international survey, with multivariate statistical analysis and descriptive findings;
- statistical multivariate cluster analysis and descriptive statistics (the latter from responses in which sex-worker respondents disclosed that unwanted sexual contact had happened to them); and
- analysis workshops with the co-investigators, and triangulation of the survey and interview results.

Project Values

Ethics and values were of the highest importance to everyone involved in the project, particularly given the study's sensitive nature, with its focus on sexual violence and barriers to justice for sex workers. Underpinning this research, then, were core values adopted by the research team, including involving experts at every stage and a commitment to trauma-informed design and delivery.

Ethical Research

Ethical approval was granted for this study by the following ethics committees:

- University of Strathclyde Approval;
- University of Leicester Approval;
- Queen's University Belfast: School of Law, Research Ethics Committee;
- University of Otago Approval;
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas; and
- The Commissioner of New Zealand Police: Approval signed by the Director of Evidence Based Policing.

(Ethical research approval was also sought from the Crown Prosecution Service in England and Wales, with the intention of including crown prosecutors in the participant sample; regrettably, however, this approval was not acquired. Crown prosecutors in England and Wales were, therefore, not recruited or interviewed for this project.)

This ethical approval ensured that the project delivered the highest standards of data security and participant safeguards, even where legislation in the research sites did not strictly require this. For example, the personal sensitive data requirements of the European Parliament (2016) General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which is in place in the European Union but not the USA or Aotearoa New Zealand, were adopted in respect of all participant data in the project. The research data were anonymised and stored securely, with open-access findings only being deposited in ways that could not allow any participants to be personally identified.

“No Research About Us, Without Us”

The participation slogan “Nothing about us, without us” has been employed by marginalised communities to promote ‘voice’ and democratic involvement in the face of injustice for many decades (cf. Stone, 1997; Yarbrough, 2019). It is as relevant to academia and sensitive research today and it has been to community involvement promoted by sex workers as survivors of violence, abuse, and criminal injustice for decades. Involving people with lived experience also means that the questions, findings, and impact of research can be more relevant and targeted to where they are needed most. The expert peer researcher group was involved in developing research survey and interview questions, collecting and analysing data, and writing up, prioritising, and disseminating the findings and recommendations (Lushey, 2017).

This participatory approach recognises that people from any community being researched have agency and can participate in research as equal researchers (Higgins et al., 2007). In addition, the research assistant role in the Aotearoa New Zealand site was delivered by NZPC: Aotearoa New Zealand Sex Workers’ Collective. This equipped the project with

resources to deliver capacity-building and to work in partnership with a sex-worker-led organisation.

The National Institute of Health Research's (NIHR, 2023) best-practice payment guidelines for working with peer researchers were adopted. An additional grant of £10,000 was awarded by the University of Strathclyde Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, to continue involvement of the peer researchers through prioritising recommendations, writing up, and disseminating findings in an accessible report.

Trauma-Informed Research Design

The project used trauma-informed practice (SAMHSA, 2014) to ensure safety for participants and safe spaces for researchers to share knowledge, in the context of engaging in emotional research work and sharing power within a research hierarchy (PARTNERS2 Writing Collective, 2020). The project was also designed with prevention in mind, that is, to ensure we did not re-traumatise people and to help us raise awareness about the impact of trauma after sexual violence and injustice in services. Although there is ongoing debate about the efficacy of trigger warnings, mostly when used with general student populations (cf. Boysen, 2017), they were designed into the advertisements used to attract study participants and the initial information about the survey and interview. Respondents could skip any questions they did not want to answer after they had consented to take part in either the survey or interviews.

The interview schedules and survey were designed so that distressing details of sexual violence and barriers to justice were asked in the safest way possible, with only very necessary questions being included and potentially triggering ones occurring approximately midway through (in line with the approach advocated by Campbell et al. (2019)). This enabled the participant to begin the interview or survey by answering simple questions first, so building up a sense of trust and a feeling of confidence about any disclosure they might then decide to make in response to more sensitive questions. Importantly, questions being organised in this way also allowed the participant to end the session on a

constructive note—when they were invited to share their recommendations for improving services in the future—and so avoid leaving them feeling triggered or distressed. Some interviewees chose to see the interview questions in advance and others were accompanied to the interview by an advocate (who separately consented to take part if they joined in with the discussion). Contact details for the research team and appropriate support services in each research site were provided on the project website, with links in the survey. A 16-hour triage system, with a contact log and a process for signposting to helpful resources and services (Campbell et al., 2010) was in place in each site, with resources hosted on the project website. (No participants reached out to gain assistance in any of the sites, despite this safety planning being in place.)

The trauma-informed approach was also important for team members given the subject matter of the research. Reflection de-briefing sessions were offered to all researchers in the team, and delivered after interviews where required, to assist in preventing the impacts of vicarious trauma, as well as to prevent and deal with any triggers reactivated through the research process.

Mixed Methods Research Design

Participatory Action Learning and Action Research (PALAR)

The project adopted a participatory action learning and action research model, as developed and demonstrated by Zuber-Skerritt (2018). Research team participation was structured through ten action learning set (ALS) sessions during the project. The expert peer researchers, research assistants in each site, the project research fellow, co-investigators, and the principal investigator all participated in the action learning set. The first session started with ground rules being co-produced by the team, so that we could ensure safe spaces for discussion. We talked about how we would equalise power dynamics, choice, and control at each stage of the project.

The whole research team, including peer researchers, trained together using action learning set methods. The ALS sessions consisted of the following themes and activities:

- discussing the themes of the research (legal norms of consent, sexual violence, sex-work regulation, reporting, and justice);
- analysing the risks to researcher and participant when interviewing about sex work and sexual violence, as well as learning techniques to mitigate and manage those risks;
- understanding trauma-informed ways of working to protect the researcher and participant from experiencing distress;
- building research interviewing skills (accessibility, active listening, and communication skills, prompting, disclosure, identifying barriers to participation);
- exploring the ethical hurdles in researching vulnerable groups;
- learning about intersectionality and diversity with marginalised communities;
- developing recommendations from interview and survey data;
- supporting the writing process;
- presenting our results to academic and community audiences; and
- organising dissemination of findings and feedback of impacts to participants and projects.

All participants were invited to reflect at the end of every session and task. A record of the action learning sets, with key information, discussion points, and resources shared, is summarised on a private, dedicated project space on the noticeboard site Padlet.

Overseeing the project was a formal project steering group made up of the core team, supported by an advisory board in each site (consisting of practitioners, sex workers, activists, and academics). In addition, an academic advisory board (consisting of eminent experts in sex work and sexual violence research) met periodically, to inform critical stages during the research, as well as to provide written advice and consultation on draft interview schedules and surveys.

Interview Recruitment and Sample

The data for this book was drawn from interviews and surveys with sex workers. Assisting with recruitment for sex workers as well as the other parties in the larger study were stakeholder groups with the following range of characteristics:

- 1) sexual violence survivors and people with lived experience of sex work;
- 2) sex-worker-led NGOs in each jurisdiction and brothel managers in Nevada;
- 3) sex workers in a wide range of sectors and the broader sex-work community;
- 4) criminal justice professionals, including police officers and prosecutors;
- 5) practitioners from outreach charities, third-sector NGOs, user-led sex-worker organisations, health services for sex workers, and sexual violence advocates; and
- 6) academic advisors specialising in law, criminology, and social research methodology.

Each site aimed to gather interviews with victim-survivors of sexual violence in sex work. In addition to the interviews used for this book, the larger project also gathered data from practitioners from NGOs, health providers, police, and prosecutors. The interview sample sizes aimed to reach thematic saturation at ten practitioners (including criminal justice professionals, NGO sex-work-project advocates, outreach workers, and health service—including sexual violence—practitioners) and ten sex workers at each of the four sites (see Guest et al., 2020 for a discussion of saturation calculations).

The interviews were semi-structured conversations, designed to explore themes from the study research questions, including unwanted contact experiences in sex work, criminal justice system experiences (including reporting, police investigation, and court experiences/outcomes), signposting, support services, and, crucially, recommendations for future improvements for sex workers after sexual violence.

Peer researchers were trained to conduct interviews with sex workers. A sample interview schedule is published with the protocol for the study (Scoular et al., 2023).

The trauma-informed principles as set out by Campbell et al. (2019) were followed at every stage of the project. Most interviews were recorded via Zoom, but some interviews with sex workers were conducted in person in brothels and outreach projects. Interviews were transcribed and coded thematically in Nvivo by three researchers, using a bespoke thematic codebook designed by Balderston, building on the aims/research questions of the study and informed by themes from the literature reviews.

In total, 110 semi-structured interviews with sex workers, criminal justice professionals, and practitioners from NGOs, charities, and health-care providers were conducted, transcribed, and analysed (see Tables 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5).

Cross-National Survey Design, Recruitment, and Sample

Following the interviews discussed above, an international survey of sex-worker and ex-sex-worker respondents in England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Aotearoa New Zealand, the USA, and Nevada legal brothels was developed to gather empirical data about sex workers' experiences of unwanted sexual contact and sexual violence, as well as their experiences of health, advocacy, and the criminal justice system. We designed the survey with sex workers and sex-worker support organisations and included consultation on the drafts with sexual violence survey experts, academics, and professionals from criminal justice and support organisations. The consulting statistician (Marriott) commented on two survey drafts. The online survey was designed to be accessible, took 15 minutes to complete, and was translated into seven languages.

In addition to the sources used to recruit project interviewees described above, social media (Twitter/X, Instagram, and the project website) was utilised to advertise the survey, and chat group messages were distributed. Moreover, sex-work platforms distributed the survey

Table 9.1 Interview frequencies by category and site

Project research site	Criminal justice professionals (including police/prosecutors)	Practitioners: Sex-worker advocacy, sexual violence NGOs, and health services	Sex-worker interviews	Total interviews
England, Scotland, and Wales	19	13	10	42
Northern Ireland	5	2	5	12
Aotearoa New Zealand	12	7	11	30
United States of America (including Nevada legal brothels)	6	6	14	26
Total interviews	42	28	40	110

Note One interview in Aotearoa New Zealand involved two participants (although one was the supporter for the main interviewee so their data has not been included); one interview in England, Scotland, and Wales involved two practitioners (one from a charity and one from a health service); and one Northern Ireland interview was conducted with three police officers. This means that a total of 113 interviewees were involved in the 110 interviews outlined above

on their sites in the USA and UK. Some print versions of the survey were distributed to outreach organisations; and the researchers completed some interviews in person through sex-worker NGOs, to ensure on-street sex workers and those without smartphone or computer literacy could participate.

Respondents were eligible to take the survey if they were aged 18 or over, were a current or former sex worker, had sold or exchanged sex for money or something of value (such as somewhere to live or to pay debts), in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, the USA (including Nevada's legal brothels), or Aotearoa New Zealand and wanted to share experiences with unwanted sexual contact.

Table 9.2 Sex-worker interview participant demographics/identity (self-described)

Demographics/Identity	Interview participants from:		
	USA	ANZ	UK
Gender			
Female	10	10	11
Male	0	0	2
Non-binary	1	0	0
Trans woman	2	1	1
Trans man	0	0	1
Age			
20–29	5	8	5
30–39	6	2	3
40–49	1	0	4
50–59	1	1	1
Ethnicity (or Nationality as self-defined)			
White (American, Aotearoa New Zealand European, British)	3	3	7
Black/African (American, British)	0	0	3
Māori	0	3	0
Indigenous American	1	0	0
Irish	0	0	1
Romanian	0	0	1
Spanish	0	0	1
Canadian	0	0	1
Pakeha	0	1	0
Mexican	1	0	0
Dual heritage/Mixed ethnicity	8	3	1
Unknown	0	1	0
Sexual orientation*			
Heterosexual	2	0	6
Lesbian/Gay	0	0	0
Bisexual	4	0	3
Pansexual/Queer/Fluid	4	0	0
Sector			
On-street	0	2	2
Brothel (legal)	4	2	0
Escorting	5	3	7
Massage/Sauna/Stripping/Dancing	1	1	0
Online	1	0	2
Various	3	3	2

*This question was not asked in Aotearoa New Zealand interviews

Table 9.3 Sex-worker interview participants (UK) (self-described)

United Kingdom		
Pseudonym	Gender	Sector
Abuya	Female	Independent
Anna	Female	Street-based
Diamond	Female	Independent
Emily	Female	Various
Halley	Female	Independent
Harrison	Male	Independent
Linda	Female	Street-based
Mo	Male	Independent
Morowa	Female	Independent
Paul	Trans man	Independent
Queen	Female	Various
Sabrina	Female	Independent
Sophia	Female	Independent
Stephanie	Trans female	Street-based
Tess	Female	Street-based

Table 9.4 Sex-worker interview participants (ANZ) (self-described)

Aotearoa New Zealand		
Pseudonym	Gender	Sector
Alice	Female	Various
Athena	Female	Street-based
Carrie	Woman	Independent
Chanelle	Woman	Various
Christine	Female	Various
Erihapeti	Female	Independent
Hunu	Trans female	Street-based
Jane	Female	Brothel
Kat	Female	Various
Sheryl	Female	Independent
Talia	Female	Brothel

Participation was entirely voluntary, and all answers were anonymous, with survey responses kept secure and confidential so that nothing in the survey could be used to identify respondents. Participants were provided with details of ethical approval, independent ethics committee contacts in each site, data protection and privacy notices, and participant information sheets. Sources of support, information, and advice on each site

Table 9.5 Sex-worker interview participants (USA) (self-described)

United States of America (including Nevada's legal brothels)		
Pseudonym	Gender	Sector
Abbey	Female	Independent
Abigail	Female	Nevada legal brothel
Bella	Female	Independent
Chrissie	Female	Various
Cielo	Female	Nevada legal brothel
Cody	Woman	Independent
Dace	Female	Nevada legal brothel
Elisa	Female	Dancing
Jessica	Female	Various
Kassandra	Female	Independent
Nancy	Female Fluid	Independent
River	Female	Various
Roxanne	Female	Nevada legal brothel
Sebastian	Non-binary	Various

were signposted throughout the survey, and participants were provided with direct contact emails for the research team. Trigger warnings for sensitive subjects and explicit questions about unwanted sexual contact were prominent, and respondents were advised that they could ignore any questions they did not want to answer. Respondents had to give consent to participate and acknowledge they were aged 18 years or over to access the survey questions.

The survey consisted of questions that included multiple-choice, four-point Likert-scale questions with 'strongly' and 'slightly' agree and disagree options, accompanied by free-text boxes. These questions focused on the following aspects:

- demographics (sex or gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, citizenship status);
- sex-work sector (on-street, escorting, brothel, massage parlour or strip club, online, other) and length of sex-work career;
- attitudes to how non-payment should be treated (legal consciousness or how sex workers view their rights and knowledge of the law);
- experiences concerning unwanted sexual contact, without permission, while sex-working. The section included how frequently unwanted

experiences had occurred (daily, weekly, monthly, or only once) and the last time something had happened. The questions were taken from the sexual victimisation module of the Crime Survey of England and Wales (including questions on rape, sexual assault, coercion, threats, physical violence, and non-consent) and were adapted to include sex-work-specific issues (clients not paying, paying less than agreed, and condom removal or ‘stealthing’). Respondents were asked for the gender and the status of the person or people who did this (e.g. client) and about any injuries, harms, and effects from what happened. They were asked who they told and if it was reported to the police, and, if so, what happened to the perpetrator through the criminal justice system and whether compensation was awarded if a conviction was gained. If the respondent did not tell anyone or report it to the police, they were asked why that was;

- respondents’ thoughts and feelings on how the police and criminal justice system deal with sexual violence against sex workers were sought, by asking them if they strongly or slightly agreed or disagreed with six statements—including “The police take rape against sex workers seriously”—and the extent to which they have overall confidence in the criminal justice system;
- questions about what would make respondents feel safer with a client (for example, if there are other sex workers and/or cameras or alarms in the building, whether they or a manager screen or background-check a client in advance, and the ability to report to blacklists) and how they negotiate and consent to sexual activities; and
- in the USA survey only, some questions regarding control over sex-work processes, age, income, and disability.

Survey Response Analysis

The survey was closed when over 1,000 responses were received. In March 2023, the survey data were cleaned and 693 unique survey responses were accepted. Responses that were duplicate, spurious compared to other data received or that contained less than 40% of

answers to the questions were excluded from analysis. The sample included sex workers who had and had not reported incidences of harm.

Unless otherwise noted, descriptive survey results are presented with a subset of respondents who had reported at least one of several forms of harm related to sex work ($n = 483$). The survey asked about harms in two ways. First, respondents were asked to describe, for several types of harm, how often each had happened over the past 12 months. Respondents were then asked a series of questions about the “last time it happened”, including what harmful behaviours they experienced, what kind of sex work they were providing, what the consequences of the harm/s were, and so on. For the purposes of this sample, we only included respondents who provided details for the last time it occurred. Respondents who reported harm in the past 12 months but skipped questions related to the most recent form of harm were not included in the subset we report on here.

We chose to measure harm by the last time it happened so that a full accounting of events could be considered across chapters without extensive instances of missing responses affecting reporting. A second justification for the decision comes from the diversity of working conditions that respondents reported. As other studies have shown (Sanders et al., 2020), sex workers tend to work in multiple environments, shifting from strip clubs to independent escorting to webcamming. The same is found to be the case in this sample, with about a quarter of respondents indicating that the type of sex work they were doing at the time of the most recent harmful incident was not the same as the one they selected as their most common method of selling sexual services. Were we to examine the yearly experiences of harm described by sex workers, we would not be able to know in which types of sex work which forms of harm occur. By limiting harm measures to the last time a harmful incident had happened, we can examine singular events resulting in harm that have a clear type of sex work associated with it.

Harm was measured as either a reported payment issue or a form of non-consensual behaviour, and both of them in the context of in-person sex work specifically. Payment issues included not being paid, being paid less than agreed, or being paid in fake money for sexual services. The options provided for non-consensual behaviour were: threats; assault;

agreeing to have sex but the client not stopping when being asked to; pursuing an exchange when the sex worker was unable to consent due to substance use; non-consensual penetration of the vagina or anus with a penis; non-consensual penetration with a finger or object; and removal of a condom during sex (referred to as ‘stealthings’). Respondents were able to write in responses alongside these options, which were manually coded into this framework to account for experiences that did not fit our predefined expectations of harm. We excluded respondents who reported a harm occurring while webcamming (whether relating to payment or non-consensual behaviours), as these cases may function differently than do harms directed at in-person sex workers.

The survey sample has some notable limitations (see Tables 9.6, 9.7, 9.8). Beyond the standard concern that the intentional recruitment model cannot generate representative findings, the sampling procedure yielded limited diversity across each field. Across all sites, fewer cisgender males and transgender women participated than had been hoped for. Street sex work was rare among our respondents in every nation. The USA had lower response rates than was expected at the Nevada brothels, limiting conclusions regarding this special case. Aotearoa New Zealand had low response rates among online sex workers and here we were unable to secure responses from street-level workers. In the UK, very few respondents worked in massage parlours or strip clubs. While it is likely that some amount of difference is due to the differing conditions under which sex work is organised in each nation, it is just as likely that the sampling strategy played a role in these discrepancies. Because of these limitations, the survey data is best used for comparison between groups as opposed to an overall reflection of sex work in each nation. Readers are advised not to take values for a given nation or working condition as demonstrating prevalence rates or population estimates. Given how little is known about the prevalence of sex work, participation in specific types of sex work, or demographics of sex workers, the degree to which these data are skewed towards demographics or working conditions of sex workers is unknown. The concerns we express regarding the conditions of the data are conjecture based on other, non-generalisable data sources and qualitative knowledge of the conditions in each nation.

We originally intended to analyse Northern Ireland separately from England, Scotland, and Wales. England and Wales are partially criminalised—selling sex is not illegal, but managing a brothel, and soliciting and living off the proceeds of prostitution are unlawful. Scotland follows the partially criminalised model from England and Wales. Northern Ireland’s Policing and Crime Act of 2009, also criminalises soliciting. Clients face a maximum penalty of 12 months in prison. Unfortunately, there were so few survey responses and interviews that we combined Northern Ireland with the rest of the UK.

Survey Participant Demographics

Table 9.6 Sex-worker survey respondents who disclosed unwanted contact (UK)

United Kingdom		
	UK responses with unwanted contact	% of UK responses with unwanted contact, in this sample
Responses from sex workers who disclosed unwanted contact (England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland*)	138	100%
What sex or gender are you?		
Female	95	68.84
Male	18	13.04
Non-binary, fluid, queer, or other	10	7.25
Trans man	7	5.07
Trans woman	8	5.80
<i>Total</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>100%</i>
How do you describe your sexual orientation?		
Heterosexual/‘Straight’	55	40.44
Lesbian or Gay	12	8.82
Bisexual	55	40.44
Asexual	5	3.68
Other	9	6.62
<i>Total</i>	<i>136</i>	<i>100%</i>

(continued)

(continued)

United Kingdom		
	UK responses with unwanted contact	% of UK responses with unwanted contact, in this sample
Where do you, or did you, mostly sell sex?		
Indoors/rented rooms, with other sex workers (brothel)	9	6.57
I normally sell sex from the street—on-street sex work	12	8.76
Escorting in-calls in my own home, hotel room, or apartment	55	40.15
Massage parlour/Strip club (licensed)	6	4.38
Escorting out-calls in client's home, hotel room, or other venue	31	22.63
Online—not in person (for example, webcamming)	20	14.60
Other	4	2.92
<i>Total</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>100%</i>
What is your ethnic origin?		
White or White British	84	62.22
Any other White background	22	16.30
Black, Black British, Caribbean, or African	5	3.70
Asian or Asian British	3	2.22
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	13	9.63
Latin, Central American, or Southern American	8	5.93
<i>Total</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>100%</i>

*Note 11 respondents from Northern Ireland are included in the UK sample who disclosed violence. The number of respondents from Northern Ireland is too small to report as a separate cohort here

A note on the race and ethnicity data we have collected: as seen from the demographic tables above, it was impossible to use the same categories for each site as there were different race and ethnicity categories relevant to a given site's geography. It can also be seen that there are some very small numbers of certain racial identities (for example, in the

Table 9.7 Sex-worker survey respondents who disclosed unwanted contact (ANZ)

Aotearoa New Zealand		
	Total responses with unwanted contact	% of ANZ responses with unwanted contact in this sample
Responses from sex workers in brothels	33	36.67
Responses from sex workers not in brothels	57	63.33
What sex or gender are you?		
Female	79	88.76
Male	1	1.12
Non-binary, fluid, queer, or other	8	8.99
Trans man	1	1.12
Trans woman	0	0
<i>Total</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>100%</i>
How do you describe your sexual orientation?		
Heterosexual/ 'Straight'	23	26.14
Lesbian/Gay	5	5.68
Bisexual	47	53.41
Asexual	1	1.14
Other	12	13.64
<i>Total</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>100%</i>
Where do you, or did you, mostly sell sex?		
I normally sell sex from the street—on-street sex work	0	0
Indoors/rented rooms, with other sex workers (brothel)	33	36.67
Escorting in-calls in my own home, hotel room, or apartment	25	27.78
Escorting out-calls in client's home, hotel room, or other venue	7	7.78
Online—not in person (for example, webcamming)	2	2.22
Massage parlour/Strip club (licensed)	22	24.44
Other	1	1.11

(continued)

Table 9.7 (continued)

Aotearoa New Zealand		
	Total responses with unwanted contact	% of ANZ responses with unwanted contact in this sample
<i>Total</i>	90	100%
Which ethnic group do you belong to?		
New Zealand European	46	51.11
Māori (part or full)	18	20.00
Other (such as Dutch, Japanese, Tokelauan)	26	28.89
<i>Total</i>	90	100%

USA sample only one person identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and in Aotearoa New Zealand, we were advised to use only three categories). This makes any cross-country comparison very tricky, and in some senses meaningless, as ‘like for like’ is not being compared. We do believe there is more to think about and discuss in relation to race and ethnicity and our overarching framework of legal consciousness, and we hope that further analysis on each site can bring out some interesting dynamics around different racial experiences.

Dissemination and Impact

In addition to this book, the research team will continue to report project findings to advisory, academic, and stakeholder audiences, through conference presentations, briefings, accessible reports (including infographics and a short animation), events with NGOs and participants, meetings, and submissions to policymakers.

Data Archiving

The ESRC require data to be transparently and accurately archived and shared for the use of other researchers in the future, but there are risks with sexual violence research involving minoritised populations

Table 9.8 Sex-worker survey respondents who disclosed unwanted contact (USA)

United States of America		
	Total responses with unwanted contact	% of USA total responses with unwanted contact in this sample
Responses from sex workers in the USA (illegal)	220	86.27
Responses from sex workers from Nevada legal brothels*	35	13.73
<i>Total</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>100%</i>
What sex or gender are you?		
Female	189	74.12
Male	25	9.80
Non-binary, fluid, queer, or other (Ze)	34	13.33
Trans man	3	1.18
Trans woman	4	1.57
<i>Total</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>100%</i>
How do you describe your sexual orientation?		
Heterosexual/'Straight'	94	37.15
Lesbian or Gay	18	7.11
Bisexual	103	40.71
Asexual	4	1.58
Other	34	13.43
<i>Total</i>	<i>253</i>	<i>100%</i>
Where do you, or did you, mostly sell sex?		
I normally sell sex from the street—on-street sex work	10	3.92
Nevada legal brothels	20	7.84
Indoors/rented rooms, with other sex workers	6	2.35
Escorting in-calls in my own home, hotel room, or apartment	80	31.37
Escorting out-calls in client's home, hotel room, or other venue	62	24.31
Massage parlour/Strip club (licensed)	19	7.45

(continued)

Table 9.8 (continued)

United States of America		
	Total responses with unwanted contact	% of USA total responses with unwanted contact in this sample
Online—not in person (for example, webcamming)	54	21.18
Other	4	1.57
<i>Total</i>	255	100%
Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?		
Hispanic or Latino	24	9.56
Not Hispanic or Latino	227	90.44
<i>Total</i>	251	100%
What is your race?		
White	181	78.35
Black or African American	31	13.42
American Indian or Alaskan Native	11	4.76
Asian	7	3.03
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0.43
<i>Total</i>	231	100%

* The total number of persons in Nevada brothels is calculated by combining individuals who reported mostly selling sex through Nevada brothels and individuals whose last experience of harm was reported as occurring in a Nevada brothel

that some respondents could be identified retrospectively by individuals with knowledge of the fields we studied (including clients, third-party managers, other sex workers, or law enforcement agents). A particular concern in this study is that so few successful convictions are secured that respondents who disclose details of such convictions can be relatively easy to identify from the court judgements and news reports that are discussed (and collated in one place). Moreover, in settings where some aspect of sex work is criminalised—as in Northern Ireland and the USA (outside legal sites in Nevada)—sex-worker respondents could potentially be identified from their details, if modifications to the archived data to maintain anonymity had not taken place. This project has undertaken extensive consultation with the funder, advisers,

statisticians, and data specialists to agree to a modified data-archiving plan, informed by the method demonstrated by Campbell et al. (2015). Consideration was given to how best to anonymize the interview data to enable interviews for secondary analysis. However, the interviews are very context-specific and detail crimes, workplaces, and information of very unique court cases. Upon taking all the elements of information out to ensure anonymity, the interviews would largely lose comprehensibility and relevance in any secondary analysis scenario. Therefore, it was determined that interview transcripts would not be released in any fashion. As we are firmly committed to secondary data analysis, particularly in populations that are both less easy to reach and equally over-researched, we have deposited the survey data.

References

- Boysen, G. A. (2017). Evidence-based answers to questions about trigger warnings for clinically-based distress: A review for teachers. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology, 3*(2), 163–177.
- Campbell, R., Adams, A. E., Wasco, S. M., Ahrens, C. E., & Sefl, T. (2010). “What has it been like for you to talk with me today?”: The impact of participating in interview research on rape survivors. *Violence against Women, 16*(1), 60–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209353576>
- Campbell, R., Fehler-Cabral, G., Pierce, S., Sharma, D., Bybee, D., Shaw, J., Horsford, S., & Feeney, H. (2015). The Detroit Sexual Assault Kit (SAK) Action Research Project (ARP), Final Report. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/248680.pdf>
- Campbell, R., Goodman-Williams, R., & Javorika, M. (2019). A trauma-informed approach to sexual violence research ethics and open science. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(23–24), 4765–4793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519871530>
- European Parliament. (2016). *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation)* [2016] OJ L 119/1.

- Guest, G., Namey, E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(5), e0232076. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232076>
- Higgins, J., Nairn, K., & Sligo, J. (2007). Peer research with youth. In S. Kindon, R. Pain, & M. Kesby (Eds.), *Participatory action research approaches and methods* (pp. 104–111). Routledge Ltd.
- Lushey, C. (2017). Peer research methodology: Challenges and solutions. *SAGE Research Methods Cases*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473994614>
- NIHR (National Institute for Health and Care Research). (2023). *Payment guidance for researchers and professionals v1.4 July 2023*. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-researchers-and-professionals/27392>
- PARTNERS2 Writing Collective. (2020). Exploring patient and public involvement (PPI) and co-production approaches in mental health research: Learning from the PARTNERS2 research programme. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, *6*(1). Retrieved July 14, 2024, from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00224-3>
- Pemberton, S., Balderston, S., & Long, J. (2021). *Trauma, social harm and health in criminal justice involved women: The Women's Risk Needs Assessment Validation Research Study Protocol*. University of Birmingham. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from <https://www.protocols.io/view/trauma-social-harm-and-health-in-criminal-justice-5qpvoy239g4o/v1/abstract>
- Sanders, T., Brents, B. G., & Wakefield, C. (2020). *Paying for sex in a digital age: US and UK perspectives*. Taylor Et Francis Group.
- Scoular, J., Sanders, T., Balderston, S., Abel, G., Brents, B. G., Ellison, G., & Marriott, N. (2023). Understanding sexual violence in sex working populations—Law, legal consciousness and legal practice in four countries (2021–2023): Study Protocol v2.5. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(11), e0283067–e0283067. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0283067>
- Stone, K. G. (1997). *Awakening to disability: Nothing about us without us*. Volcano Press.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). (2014). Concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration *Briefing*, 14–4884. Retrieved December 13, 2023, from https://ncsacw.acf.hhs.gov/userfiles/files/SAMHSA_Trauma.pdf
- Yarbrough, D. (2019). “Nothing about us without us”: Reading protests against oppressive knowledge production as guidelines for solidarity research.

Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 089124161985713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241619857134>

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2018). An educational framework for participatory action learning and action research (PALAR). *Educational Action Research*, 26(4), 513–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2018.1464939>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

