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Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the critical, legal, ethical and methodological considerations when managing sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology. Stakes are high in these projects, and that is why it is critical to ensure minimal risk and the best outcome for everyone involved. There are numerous publications of research papers in criminal and forensic psychology, but very few outline the actual project management considerations behind the research project. Dr. Ann Burgess and her husband, Dr. Allen Burgess, are world renowned researchers in this field, and have managed numerous successful and noted sensitive research projects. In this study, qualitative methods are used to gather extraordinary insights into their work, and especially their project with the FBI, which involved mapping out behaviors of serial killers. This project has been prominently showcased in the Netflix TV series, Mindhunters. Additionally, two experts in relevant fields are interviewed. Professor Gísli Guðjónsson, one of the world’s leading forensic psychologists and Daði Kristjánsson a district court judge in Iceland and former prosecutor. The outcome of this study generates four different and useful tools for future project managers in sensitive research projects; team structure and role guidelines, stakeholder analysis, a comprehensive process map for a sensitive research project, and an overview of critical considerations regarding the key themes in all project phases.
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1. Introduction

While I was studying for a master’s degree in Project Management at Reykjavik University, it often crossed my mind that its methods and tools would be extremely useful and effective in almost every field, from running a global company to the public sector, and even in managing your household. There has been a rapid evolution in project management over the last decade, and its use has grown more widespread between different sectors. However, coming from the public sector, I know that there are still untapped opportunities for project management. Working within the judiciary system for the last eight years, I’ve been faced with difficult cases and difficult people. I have also been studying project management for almost two years, and for as long as I can remember I’ve been wanting to get a better understanding of people and their behavior, asking myself why we do what we do. Those interests and thoughts seemed to come together when it was announced that Dr. Ann Burgess and her husband, Dr. Allen Burgess, would be giving a lecture at the University in April 2018, called Project Management: Serial Killers — The truth about the Mindhunter research project. Dr. Ann Burgess was the inspiration behind the character Dr. Wendy Carr in Netflix’s original series, Mindhunter. The premise of the show is the FBI’s development of a new criminal field in the 1970s, with two of their agents travelling around the country interviewing serial killers, in an effort to map out their responses. They are joined by a Dr. Wendy Carr, a psychology professor who helps them to develop a system to categorize serial killers and map out their behavior (Blessing, 2018). In real life, Dr. Ann Burgess is an internationally recognized forensic nurse and a professor at Boston College, who has performed and published countless research projects in various sensitive fields, such as internet sex crimes, assessment and treatment of victims of abuse, and the project she worked on with the FBI, creating a modern psychological profiling system for serial killers. She and her husband, Dr. Allen Burgess, whose background is in business administration, work closely together and as they themselves say “develop study objectives together, where Ann collects data and interfaces with subjects and obtains the relevant approvals for the study, while Allen develops methodology and the statistical analysis”. An in-depth interview was conducted with both Ann and Allen Burgess, using the FBI’s Mindhunter project as a case example to answer the following research question:

What are the critical, legal, ethical and methodological considerations when managing sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology?

To further investigate this topic, an in-depth interview was conducted with one of the world’s leading forensic psychologists, practitioner and researcher, Professor Gísli Guðjónsson. His research and testimonies have resulted in judgements being reversed all over the world. Clemencies have been granted and a change in police interrogation methods has ensued. Professor Guðjónsson is formidably experienced in performing sensitive research projects, and has published extensively in sensitive fields, such as sexual offending, psychogenic amnesia, psychological vulnerability, false confession, police interviewing and false/recovered memories. A shorter interview was also conducted with district court judge, Daði Kristjánsson, as he has extensive legal experience working within the criminal justice system in Iceland. He is also a trained police officer and worked as a prosecutor for years.
With this qualitative research, a great insight was gained into the different considerations and aspects of managing sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology. The objective was to get a holistic view from the project manager’s perspective, list the main legal, ethical and methodological considerations that affect the project, and give it structure and boundaries.

2. Literature review

The literature review focuses on three key concepts and three main themes that give a comprehensive view of what the critical considerations are in sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology. The key concepts are “project management”, “sensitive research projects” and “criminal and forensic psychology”, and the themes are “legal”, “ethical” and “methodological”. In order to examine the research question, it is important to define and understand the key concepts and themes.

![Figure 1. Relations between key concepts and themes](image)

2.1 Key concepts

2.1.1 Project management
In the field of project management, the concept of a project has been defined in many ways. Kerzner (2009) defines a project as having specific objectives and completion specifications, a predefined start and end, with funding limitations in some cases, as needing both human resources and material resources and as being multifunctional. Another example of a definition is that a project is a “temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or results. The temporary nature of projects indicates that a project has a definite beginning and end” (Project Management Institute, 2013, p. 3).

Project management is a specific methodology used to reach project objectives by applying different knowledge, skills and tools. Managing a project includes identifying
objectives, managing stakeholders and balancing project constraints, such as risks, budget, schedule, etc. (Project Management Institute, 2013). Project management also entails the overall planning, organizing and managing of a project, and can be categorized into five activities (Mikkelsen & Riis, 2013):

1. Leading and managing the project; Monitoring quality issues, progress, changes and managing the people involved with the project and its stakeholders.
2. Planning and course of action; developing a master plan, determining the phases and milestones of the project, and the activities needed to execute the plan.
3. Organization and collaboration; Effective communication to ensure appropriate project culture, quality and efficiency. Here it is also important to design a project organization structure that has enough external authority to be able to deliver the project objectives independently from the rest of the organization.
4. Points of attention; Change management and addressing uncertainty in the project.
5. Learning; It’s important to reflect and learn from experience and manufacture guidelines both at the end of the project and while it is ongoing.

2.1.2 Sensitive research projects
According to Brown, Shell & Cole (2015), a research project is classified as a scientific investigation that uses scientific methods to obtain clear and defined objectives. In general, the cycle of starting and finishing a research project can be broken down into seven stages that are useful to follow. Firstly, it is important to identify a new angle and determine the research topic and research question. This involves reviewing literature to see what has been written before on the subject, clarifying what is already known, both in support and in contradiction of the topic, ascertaining the limits of the projects and preparing an ethics application. The next step is to determine the methodological approach in data collection and analysis. This step involves selecting an appropriate method, checking to ensure respondent viability, deciding on the form of data needed and so forth. Thirdly, a proposal needs to be written, where all necessary information is clearly stated. The proposal is in many ways similar to a project plan. The fourth stage is to get both scientific and ethical reviews on the project, in which all appropriate permissions are ensured. The next step is to analyze the data, and finally findings are written in the form required (Brown, Shell & Cole, 2015).

To ascertain what the critical considerations are when managing not just a research project, but a sensitive research project, it is important to determine what research projects are considered “sensitive”. Many attempts have been made to define what the concept of sensitive research is, ranging from those that only consider the topic of investigation to those that take into consideration the whole of the research and all its implications in practice and within the research community (Dickson-Swift, James & Liamputton, 2008). The definition of “sensitive” may also be dependent on both context, cultural norms and values. Some have suggested that the risk of consequences for participants or the individuals represented by the study is the determining factor for sensitivity classification (McCosker, Barnard & Gerber, 2001). In the same way, Raymond Lee (1993) suggests that sensitive research poses a threat to those
involved. Furthermore, he alleges that sensitive research projects can create both methodological and technical issues, such as physical safety, conceptualization of the topic and mistrust between researcher and participants. Conducting research on sensitive issues like rape or murder can also have a considerable impact on the researcher. It can trigger memories of their own previous traumas and provoke fear about possible future traumas or victimization (Brown, Shell & Cole, 2015). In this article, the focal point is research projects in criminal and forensic psychology which fall within the criteria and are sensitive for the researchers, perpetrators, their victims and the families of everyone involved.

Not much has been written about project management being used specifically in sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology, so using the Mindhunter project as an example and interviewing experts in the field provides new insights. However, there is quite a lot of literature about how research in general relates to project management and its importance. Beverly Paisan (2015) offers that research is important in order to develop new and existing knowledge in projects so as to advance the field. As the project management field is constantly growing, research has become more and more important, especially when reaching out to other sectors.

2.1.3 Criminal and forensic psychology

Criminal psychology and forensic psychology are often perceived to be the same field, and the terms are used interchangeably by many. However, this is a misconception, and despite overlaps they are, in fact, two different areas of psychology. Criminal psychology is the psychology of criminal behavior, including the thought processes, intentions and motivations of criminals. In short, its goal is to determine why criminals do what they do. Forensic psychology focuses more on the criminal justice system itself and can also include civil law. Work in this field also extends to mental health, child, family, alcohol and drug services, to name a few. It is important to note that these fields have developed very differently in various parts of the world, and that the roles of criminal or forensic psychologists vary accordingly. In both areas, they can be practitioners and/or researchers (Howitt, 2015).

Criminal profiling is a part of criminal psychology and studies the minds of criminals, endeavoring to understand what motivates their behavior and using that understanding to build up criminal profiles of distinct offender types. Douglas, Ressler, Burgess, and Hartman (1986) state that criminal profiling is a valued means for law enforcement in narrowing the field of investigation. They specify that criminal profiling does not deliver the exact identity of the offender, but gives indications as to what kind of an individual can be classified as being more likely than others to commit the crime, focusing on behavioral and personality characteristics. These characteristics can be age, personality, gender and even what kind of environment the criminal is likely to live in. This was proved to be successful, for example, in 1981, when John E. Douglas, one of the FBI’s top profilers, and Burgess’s former research partner, accurately predicted that a child serial killer in Atlanta would be a young, African-American male who owned a German Shepherd dog and was preoccupied with police culture (Scottsdale, nd).

There has also been some skepticism towards the empirical validity of the criminal profiling process. Though there is support for the view that it can produce a more accurate
prediction of an unknown offender in comparison to other studied groups, the results of the predictions are heavily correlated to the skills of the profiler (Kocsis, 2003).

On the relevance between profiling and other sectors, Douglas, Ressler, Burgess, and Hartman (1986, p. 405) compare the criminal profile process to how clinicians make a diagnosis and treatment plan, stating “data are collected and assessed, the situation reconstructed, hypotheses formulated, a profile developed and tested, and the results reported back”. They further explain that for this process to be successful, the criminal psychologists will need to review and often conduct extensive research projects.

There have been numerous research projects published relating to criminal and forensic psychology, yet only a few of them set out in detail the project management process behind the project.

2.2 Three themes

2.2.1 Legal

Before starting any research, it is necessary to obtain approval from relevant regulatory authorities and to note that to do so is a prerequisite for a study to be a valid publication and academic input. Therefore, legal considerations are crucial when managing a sensitive research project. There are numerous regulatory institutes in each country that have the function of protecting the safety of subjects who are involved in research. There are also various international guidelines and regulations in place to monitor and regulate research issues, such as informed consent, confidentiality, incentives and misconduct. Researchers should take notice of these international guidelines, as well as of regional differences in legislation, for these differ from country to country in terms of what legal requirements and regulations a researcher needs to adhere to (Yip, Han & Sng, 2016). Such international guidelines are exemplified in The Nuremberg Code which was developed in 1947 following the Nuremberg Military Tribunal, which revealed atrocious medical experiments perpetrated by the Nazis. The code lays out ten standards that must be met by researchers:

1. Research participants must give their voluntary consent
2. Research needs to be beneficial to society
3. Research must be appropriately designed
4. Researchers must avoid inflicting harm
5. A study cannot commence if there is a risk of causing death or disability
6. Risks to participants should not exceed benefits
7. Adequate preparations must be made to protect against harm
8. Research must be conducted by qualified researchers
9. Participants can withdraw
10. Research must cease if there is cause to believe that its continuation will cause harm
These are all ethical guidelines, but, in evidence of how close ethical and legal considerations can be, some jurisdictions, such as the United States, Canada and Australia have incorporated these ten principles into law. In these jurisdictions, all research that may cause harm is subject to review from Institutional Review Boards (hereafter IRBs) (Melville & Hincks, 2016). In the interview with Dr. Ann Burgess given for this study, she stated that, in addition to this, the subjects should also consult with their attorneys about participating in the project. She goes on to say that an IRB approval also means that not many changes can be made to the research in its cycle without having to apply again. From within the criminal justice system there are legal considerations that investigators, whether they are the police, prosecution, researchers or defenders, are obligated to follow - considerations regarding, for example, confidentiality towards the media and others outside of the project, legal requirements for collecting and storing data, due process, rules regarding the procedural side of an interview, as well as legal and constitutional rights, regulations regarding concessions, etc. (Melville & Hincks, 2016).

2.2.2 Ethics
The nature of sensitive research projects can be ethically challenging, as it involves the personal participation of subjects in very special and fragile circumstances (Loff & Black, 2000). That is why it is imperative to form clear and specific ethical guidelines that everyone on the research team understands and abides by (Mahnaz, Bahramnezhad, Fomani, Shoghi, and Cheraghi, 2014).

There is quite a lot of literature written on ethics and how they are relevant to project management. Jonasson & Ingason (2013, p. 7) define ethics as “the discipline, often classified as a sub-discipline of philosophy, that is concerned with what is good and just for individuals, groups, organizations and society...In modern society, ethics define how individuals, professionals, corporations and societies choose to interact with one another”. They go on to explain that, even though project management is a general term that encompasses various roles and sectors, a shared aspect is the willingness to deliver objectives with competence. Ethics in the context of research projects can be applied to this. Jonasson & Ingason (2015), in their chapter on ethical considerations in project management research, specifically stipulate that for a project management research to be good, it should consider both the research topic, as well as all the ethical implications of the project. They introduce five ethical approaches that help project managers with identifying ethical risks. These are: virtue-based ethics, utility-based ethics, duty-based ethics, rights-based ethics and care-based ethics. Another insight into research ethics comes from The American Psychology Association, who have set forth five principles for research ethics: discussing intellectual property frankly, e.g. being clear on who gets credit for authorship, consciousness of multiple roles within the study, following informed consent rules from participants, respecting confidentiality and privacy and knowing and understanding ethical obligations and what resources are available (Smith, 2003).

Addressing guidelines from institutional review boards, Van den Hoonnaard (2002) states that the ethical “impositions” can be challenging for the outcome of a project. These guidelines, though stringent, are necessary, and there to uphold the wellbeing of all participants. He goes on to say that some have criticized their impact on the value of information in the
research. Qualitative research should be ethically based on the freely given informed consent of research subjects (Hoong, 2005), but when the research subject is, for example, legally confined and mentally unstable, many ethical questions can arise, and IRB approval can be hard to get. Likewise, protecting confidentiality when the research subject is expressing valuable insight from personal experience is something that might be very hard to ensure, unless the researcher compromises the quality of the research outcome with a more ambiguous and less insightful research text (Van den Hoonaard, 2002).

2.2.3 Methodology
In every research project, the selection of methodology is a very important stage of the research, and the selection depends on what the goal of the project is. In a way, the research question determines the method chosen, so the choice of methodological approach is linked to the scientific research objectives. No method is better than another, it’s just a matter of finding the right method for the research objective and so maximizing the odds for success (Pasian, 2015). The topic then determines the methodology chosen, whether it be qualitative, quantitative or a mixture of both. For the purpose of this study, a qualitative method was chosen, because of the nature of the research question. Jonasson & Ingason (2015) state that “Qualitative project management research is any high-level enquiry conducted to find, and interpret, data that can be collected or laid out without quantifying it”. They go on to say that “The methods can be structured, where the activities and behavior are accounted for in a comprehensive way, or they can be non-structured, where the researcher is basically working with whatever material he or she has at hand.” Although this was written in the context of ethical grey areas, its principles still apply to methodology selection in general.

2.3 Expert insight
To get a closer and more in-depth insight into the research question, experts in relevant fields were sought out and interviewed. Dr. Ann Burgess, Dr. Allen Burgess and Professor Gíslí Guðjónsson all have extensive experience in sensitive research projects relating to psychology. Daði Kristjánsson, an Icelandic district court judge and former prosecutor, has immense experience working within the criminal system in various capacities, and has great insights into their inner workings and how they could relate to project management. Dr. Ann Burgess was instrumental in the FBI’s Behavioral Science Unit (BSU) criminal profiling project in the 1970s (Mindhunter project). She and her team started by profiling criminals on an informal basis, by using crime scene information, case records, direct observations and first-hand investigative interviews. According to Dr. Ann Burgess, this study was formalized in 1982 with a grant from the National Institute of Justice, differentiating itself from former research by being from the perspective of law enforcement, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis. Following the study, the team published the Crime Classification Manual: A Standard System for Investigating and Classifying Violent Crime (2013), a book that standardized language and terminology used in the American criminal justice system, published as a direct result of the aforementioned project. By interviewing Drs. Ann and Allen
Burgess about their practices and the Mindhunter project in particular, great insight into how project management relates to and can be used in sensitive research projects is gained. Gísli Guðjónsson, a practitioner and researcher in the field of forensic psychology as well as a former professor at King’s College in London, has been involved with hundreds of sensitive research projects. His focus has mainly been on false confessions - he coined the term ‘memory distrust syndrome (MDS), “to describe a condition where people develop profound distrust of their memory and become susceptible to relying on external cues and suggestions from others.”’ (Gudjonsson, 2017, p. 156). His years of experience in the field are an invaluable source and offer an outstandingly useful insight into how project management is or can be used in sensitive research projects.

3. Method
A qualitative research method was chosen for this study with in-depth interviews with various experts in relevant fields. The main goal was to gain an “expert insight” into the field of project management for sensitive research projects relating to criminal and forensic psychology. This was a chance to interview professionals who have years of experience and could accelerate learning and help with identifying new and unique insights into the research field in relation to project management.

3.1 Study duration and procedures
The data collection started in February and ended by the end of April 2018. The interview process was a combination of back-and-forth email communication and telephone and face-to-face conversations. The main challenge was to reach out to these experts and persuade them to give up their valuable time and be part of this study. It was important to show flexibility and offer the most convenient interview format for the expert to respond to, otherwise one might lose their interest in participating.

The benefits and challenges associated with using email interviewing in qualitative research was carefully considered, and it was concluded that, while a face-to-face mode interviewing strategy would be optimal and should be considered when possible (Schneider, 2002), email interviewing can be necessary and convenient in many cases as a viable alternative (Lokman, 2006). One of the main limitations of email interviewing is that you won’t be able to pick up important visual and verbal cues from your research subject, like facial expressions, body language or shifts in the tone of voice (Selwyn & Robson, 1998). It’s important here to note that, unlike e-mail surveys, the interviews using this method in this study were semi-structured to each respondent, involving e-mail exchanges between the interviewer and interviewee over an extended period of time. The face-to-face interviews were also semi-structured, which allowed open discussion and flow from the respondents.
3.2 Subject selection and limitation

Choosing the right sample of respondents was critical to gaining the insight necessary to apply credible considerations for managing sensitive research projects. Sensitive research projects might be considered to be quite a “niche field of study”, which also meant it could be a challenge gathering the necessary expert talent required. Six experts were chosen for the sample after extensive research, with four experts agreeing to participate in the study. The main interviewees were Dr. Ann Burgess and her husband, Dr. Allen Burgess, as this thesis depends largely on the knowledge gained from their work. It was equally important to gain insights from other experts that could bring additional aspects and comparisons to the viewpoints that delineate the boundaries in sensitive research projects. To that end, additional interviews with Professor Gísli Guðjónsson and judge Daði Kristjánsson were conducted. The selection criteria for the subject sample was that the interviewees would have to have expertise in at least one of the following areas:

1. Legal
2. Ethical
3. Methodological
4. Project Management
5. Sensitive Research Projects
6. Criminal and Forensic Psychology

Each respondent could have more than one of the listed areas of expertise and would receive a tailored questionnaire to match their experience. The details of participants and the interviewing process can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. Sample selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Interview method</th>
<th>Interview period (2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ann Wolbert Burgess</td>
<td>Author, researcher, professor at Boston College, Forensic nurse</td>
<td>Legal, Ethical, Method, Project Management, Sensitive Research Projects, Criminal and/or Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>E-mail, face-to-face</td>
<td>March 20 – 27, April 18 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allen Burgess</td>
<td>Author, researcher, Doctor of business administration</td>
<td>No, Yes</td>
<td>E-mail, face-to-face</td>
<td>March 20 – 27, April 18 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gísli Guðjónsson</td>
<td>Author, researcher, professor and practitioner in forensic psychology</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td>Face-to-face, telephone</td>
<td>March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daði Kristjánsson</td>
<td>Icelandic District Court Judge and a former police officer and prosecutor</td>
<td>Yes, No, No, No</td>
<td>E-mail, telephone</td>
<td>March 27 – April 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Instrumentation and data analysis

Dr. Ann Burgess and Dr. Allen Burgess were given a semi-structured questionnaire seen below, while Daði Kristjánsson and Gísli Guðjónsson received an excerpt from it aligned to their respective areas of expertise.

Table 2. Questionnaire: Key questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Output measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What are the critical considerations in criminal/forensic psychology when managing a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Criminal/forensic psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What are the critical considerations in legal context when managing a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What are the ethical considerations when managing a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are the methodological considerations when managing a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What are the critical project management considerations when managing a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the key questions, further general questions (as seen in table 3) were asked to establish the relevance of project management in the expert’s experience of research projects.
# Table 3. Questionnaire: General questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Output measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is there in your opinion relevance between your work and project management?</td>
<td>Relevance to project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Can you name a few things that you find are the most important for a research project to be successful?</td>
<td>Success factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How much can you plan in advance these kinds of sensitive research projects?</td>
<td>Project planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the plan change a lot along the way and how do you address that? Is flexibility important?</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What kind of tools / methods did you use to manage the project and what do you feel might have been done better if you were to do it again?</td>
<td>Tools and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What methods did you use in the project to collect and store data?</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What was the main obstacle you faced in the project?</td>
<td>Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What would you say are the main obstacles today in extensive research projects?</td>
<td>Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Where did the main work / management take place in the project?</td>
<td>Project location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Who were the main collaborators / stakeholders in the project?</td>
<td>Collaborators / Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do you have a specific method in managing stakeholders?</td>
<td>Stakeholder management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>How important is the project manager’s ability to show compassion and empathy in managing these kinds of projects?</td>
<td>Importance of empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>How important are “soft” skills versus “hard” skills (emotional intelligence versus technical intelligence) when managing these kinds of research projects?</td>
<td>Hard skills vs soft skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>When you are involved in research projects do you have a plan as to how it is best to manage the team and to keep them motivated?</td>
<td>Team motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>What is the best advice you would give a project manager that is starting a sensitive research project?</td>
<td>Main learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

The following are the results from the qualitative study carried out with input from four experts on the concepts and themes of the research question. The data analysis outlines the critical considerations when managing sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology, focusing on legal, ethical and methodological aspects. To show the findings, the key concepts and key themes have been subcategorized and examples of answers from the experts quoted as they relate to each topic. In each category, all of the data has been compiled together and sorted to show the overall findings.

4.1 Management considerations

In the qualitative interviews, the experts were asked about the relevance and considerations of project management in sensitive research projects in criminal psychology. When asked the key question of what the project management considerations were when managing a sensitive research project, Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess stated:

“Identify your topic, select your team, be sure you have a content expert and mentors, and identify your stakeholders.

... Staff selection is critical – experience in managing sensitive information and prior research experience is desired. Compatibility of team members is important. Team ethics needs to be constantly emphasized by the project director. Everyone needs to protect the subjects and their privacy.”

Taking the Mindhunter project as an example:

“In our case, we used staff that we knew and had worked with before on a heart attack study. They knew each other and looked forward to another project. We were funded by the National Institute of Justice”.

They further emphasized the research team selection, structure and the importance of motivation, stating:

“You always need a content expert for what is to be studied and to know if new findings are occurring or if the study is replicating prior studies. You need a good methodologist for handling the data analysis.

... You need regular team meetings to keep motivation high. The manager needs to identify any problems that arise and handle them immediately. Individual meetings with team members is important as well as the group meetings. Staff needs to feel a part of the project. It is also important what is motivating each team member, e.g., employment, advancement in one’s job, money, etc. All members need to feel they are contributing. Team ethics needs to be constantly emphasized by the project director.”

When asked about the importance of soft vs hard skills in managing a research project, Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess answered:
“You need both sets of skills. The soft skills are needed to keep morale and motivation high with the team and the hard skills are needed for the integrity of the project and its contribution to science”.

Forensic psychologist Gísli Guðjónsson gave great insight into the subject of teams in research projects, and stated that he prefers to work in a team and considers it a key success factor:

“A good team structure is critical for successful execution of the research output. The delegation of work has changed over time. Researchers often used to work alone on research projects, but now you need a bigger team, as the research environment is much more global and complex, and you have more extensive literature reviews.

…
Team cooperation is the key to success in a research project. If you don’t have it, you’ll be more likely to have weak links, low morale and no trust”.

Gísli also mentioned the importance of different skills in a team:

“Scientific research projects are complex and need teams of people with different skill sets. You need someone that is creative, brings the ideas to life and finds a good approach for the research, someone that can plan the process efficiently, someone that has access to the data, someone that has in-depth knowledge of data analysis and someone proficient in writing research text”.

After analyzing the data, it was possible to determine the optimal team roles, responsibilities and skills in sensitive research projects. In table 4, each role has been given a specific title, their responsibilities have been outlined, and the relevant skills required listed. Note that one team member can hold one or more roles.


Table 4. Team structure guidelines in sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Project Role</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Director</td>
<td>Project management, Research objectives, Delegate work, Team motivation, Stakeholders</td>
<td>Expert in research area, empathy, project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Creative</td>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>Creative, innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Collector</td>
<td>Collects data and interfaces with the subjects</td>
<td>Logical, impartial, empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Resource</td>
<td>Provides access to data</td>
<td>Connection to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Analyst</td>
<td>Analyzes the data</td>
<td>Expert, in-depth knowledge in analytics, logical, impartial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Writer</td>
<td>Writes the research and proposals</td>
<td>Proficient writer, detail oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder management, as part of the project management aspect of the research question, was also mentioned by Drs. Ann and Allen stating - and giving an example from the Mindhunter project:

“Each of the stakeholders must be handled for their own individual goals. They have different needs and all must be answered. In our case, we needed to insure FBI reputation and integrity remained high. In other cases, the project objectives must be met to satisfy the stakeholders as they have placed their trust in the team”.

Stakeholder analysis is defined as a “process of systematically gathering and analyzing qualitative information to determine whose interests should be taken into account when developing and/or implementing a policy or program” (Schmeer, 2000, p.4). Three categories of stakeholders naturally emerged after an overall analysis of the qualitative interviews with the experts. They are “participants”, “supporters” and “community”. The stakeholders are visually represented in table 5, with information about who they are, their function, and what is the appropriate course of action for each.
Table 5. Stakeholder analysis for sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PARTICIPANTS| Participate actively in the project process | • Head researcher  
• Research team  
• Research subjects | • Engage participation  
• Protect privacy and safety |
| SUPPORTERS  | Support the project with high-level financial, regulatory and/or informational resources | • Project owner  
• IRBs  
• Mentors | • Seek guidance  
• Inform  
• Protect reputation and integrity |
| COMMUNITY   | Have interest in the outcome of the project | • Research users  
• Media  
• Associations relevant to research topic  
• Research mean | • Create awareness  
• Minimize risk  
• Information quality control |

4.2 Legal, ethical and methodological considerations

Below are the insights given by the four experts on how the three themes affect and give boundaries to sensitive research projects. In each theme, the most relevant answers are highlighted, and at the end all the data is brought together in a flow chart that shows the effects of the themes.

4.2.1 Legal considerations

From the interviews, the importance of legal considerations was apparent. All experts emphasized and gave insights into different aspects of legal considerations. When Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess were asked the key question of what the legal considerations are when managing a sensitive research project, they said:

"It is critical to reduce any chance of a legal suit claiming you did not protect the privacy of a client. One always must be mindful of a class action suit for all of you subjects if there is even one breach of confidentiality. The test instrument/questionnaire must be designed to prevent identification of the subject’s data. Collected data must be aggregated for all publications/reports. Original instruments need to be kept in a secure facility or location with a minimal number of persons having access to the location”.

They go on to apply the question to the Mindhunter project:

“In our case, the prisoners had to have completed the appeal process so the FBI agents could not be called upon to provide any legal testimony and the records could not be subject to a subpoena since they were de-identified and only contained a number. The agents also had to inform the subject that if a new crime was disclosed, they had to report it”. 
Forensic psychologist Gísli Guðjónsson echoes that sentiment:

“On this matter, it is imperative to always follow the law in the country in which one is managing a research project. In Britain, for example, there are stringent regulations and disclaimers under the law for the research project to be valid. These include regulation on how to store data and how it should be encrypted to minimize the danger of a leak”.

District court judge Daði Kristjánsson focuses more on the legal considerations in the actual work in the criminal justice system, rather than the research aspect of it, by explaining the boundaries that the police and prosecutors must adhere to when handling an alleged criminal:

“When interrogating suspects, it is imperative to follow all regulations about the implementation of the interview, its duration and style, because the questions cannot be misleading or give a skewed image of the case. The police also cannot promise concessions or mislead the suspects into confessing, or inform on accomplices, as that has to be formally done by the prosecution. The rights of the suspect always have to be upheld in every way, and the approach to every case/project has to be objective and conscientious”.

Daði also echoes the importance of regulations regarding data collection and storing:

“It is very important to be meticulous in handling data and its storage has to be according to recognized standards and regulations, so as not to reduce the reliability of the case. Confidentiality issues are also very important when handling the data, both when collecting and afterwards, both with regard to protecting the investigation and to privacy laws. That includes media considerations, as their interest in sensitive cases can be high and confidentiality especially important”.

He also strongly emphasized the duty to ensure the safety of subjects involved in a case, saying that:

“There is an obligation to ensure a suspect’s safety and that becomes more challenging in the more serious, difficult and sensitive cases. The risks can include, for example, revenge by accomplices, attacks from the community or the victims’ families or risk of suicide, especially when in custody, because when a suspect has been released, the legal obligation becomes less clear and more of an ethical question”.

4.2.2 Ethical considerations
The question of ethics resulted in very interesting and informative insights from the four experts. When Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess were asked the key question of what the ethical considerations are when managing a sensitive research project, they said:

“Ethical considerations include being careful not to discuss data about the project that could result in a breach of confidentiality. At no time should any individual information be discussed. The subjects have trusted that their privacy would be protected. The subjects need to sign a consent form that has been approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB)”.
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They go on to apply the concept to the Mindhunter project:

“In our case, many of the prisoners also consulted with their attorney regarding participation in the project… In our case, we were collecting data on criminals who raped and murdered and trying to understand their patterns and motives – the information was considered sensitive and prisoners are considered a vulnerable population to study… In our case, we used staff that we knew and had worked with before on a heart attack study. They knew each other and looked forward to another project. We were funded by the National Institute of Justice”.

The concept of privacy in the context of ethics was mentioned many times, for instance Drs. Ann and Allen stated that:

“… Equally important is managing the protection and privacy of the subjects and insuring that the project team understands the sensitivity of the project”.

While on the subject of team roles they also stated that:

“Team ethics needs to be constantly emphasized by the project director. Everyone needs to protect the subjects and their privacy”.

When asked about the importance of empathy and compassion, Drs. Ann and Allen were clear on its importance:

“Compassion and empathy are very important and personal feelings about the data collected cannot come into the process. Project managers need to keep the objective and outcome in sight and be empathetic to the data being collected.

…

You need to have respect for the subjects providing the data”.

And as for the Mindhunter case specifically:

“… For example, the FBI agents interviewed the criminals and we all needed to respect the answers provided despite how the team felt about the content”.

One aspect of the ethical considerations was the rules and protocol regarding authorship and Drs. Ann and Allen gave an example from the Mindhunter project:

“Authorship is always important to have worked out before starting the project. In our case, we wrote articles for the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin and professional journals (American Journal of Psychiatry) and a textbook with the final analyses. The agents each wrote books after they retired from the FBI but all publications had to go through FBI review process”.

Forensic psychologist Gísli Guðjónsson was also very firm on the importance of authorship in research projects, and in fact in all projects. He mentioned how unethical it was to put your
name on a project you had no involvement in or to use the labor of others without citing them on the project. He stated:

“Another ethical question is - what name do you put on a project when you publish? Some are, of course, obvious, but then there are often students that have worked on it and in my mind you never use the labor of students unless they are also cited on the project. Their labor and input is often very important, not to mention important for themselves as they are starting their careers. Not citing them can also lead to students losing interest and dropping out”.

Further on the subject of responsibility he states:

“The head writer or director of the project should always take responsibility if a mistake is made and always admit to it even though it is uncomfortable and the mistake small or unimportant. Everyone can make mistakes, the pitfall is when one starts to lie and cover them up”.

Other ethical considerations Gísli named were on the importance of ethics committees and peer review, saying:

“Always seek out advice from peer supervisors or ethics committees if questions arise about ethical, legal or methodological risks involving the research project”.

He also referred to the dilemma of what should be published and what might be too sensitive to publish with or without names, saying that now it is not enough to change names, especially in very public cases. The researcher always needs to get consent from the subject. In very difficult cases, it can also be a balancing act which involves weighing the gain of learning from a case by publishing it against the cost of doing so to the participants and others connected to the case. Nowadays, public cases get so much coverage, and according to Gísli it can continuously re-open wounds among the victims, the families involved and the subjects. Here again he says it is important to look at what the gain is versus the consequences of the research, but as hard as these studies can be, the truth and making sure, for example, that a false confession doesn’t go unnoticed is fundamental.

District court judge Daði Kristjánsson focused more on the legal considerations, but regarding ethical considerations and their relation to the judiciary system he stated:

“Ethical considerations are closely related to legal considerations, and they go hand in hand... The focal point is always that it is ethically better for a guilty individual to go free than for an innocent person to be convicted”.
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4.2.3 Methodological considerations

The four experts were also asked what the methodological considerations are when managing a sensitive research project. When asked this key question, Drs. Ann and Allen stated:

“The most critical task in managing a sensitive project is setting clearly achievable objectives designed to answer research questions and/or testing of a hypothesis. Once the study objectives have been determined, then the Team ethics needs to be constantly emphasized by the project director. Standardized testing instruments are always preferred since they usually have reported psychometrics to insure their reliability. The appropriate statistical test needs to be selected to measure the objectives”.

They go on to explain the IRB approval restrictions on the methodology of planning the project and:

“While a lot can be done in advance, you need IRB approval before you can collect data – unless you are doing a secondary analysis on an existing data set. Things to be done in advance include doing a test run with a prototype instrument is a necessity to eliminate bugs in the software program. However, you cannot predict what might go wrong once the project starts, but typically problems come from ambiguity in objects or the testing instrument… You can’t change anything major once you have IRB approval. At Boston College, any addition to the project must go back to IRB for approval”.

Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess also underlined the importance of quality data when managing a research project, and gave an example from the Mindhunter project of specific tools and methods and the data storage protocol:

“Quality of data is critical. The power of the sample size needs to be adequate to meet the objectives. It is important not to over-promise more subjects that you can realistically find. Subjects can refuse to participate. In the serial murderer study several offenders refused to participate.

... After each interview we assembled the team to discuss the interview, enter the data on the 57-page instrument and make notes. At the end of the project we reviewed the instrument for additional items, and removed questions that were redundant or not useful. We also found that the instrument was too long and difficult to use. In extensive research project, there is a need to be mindful of the pressure on the subject to answer questions and the length of the interviews. Again, it is critical to have pilot tested the questions and instruments to be used in a project. Short, in-depth answers will often provide the greatest yield of data. You can’t ask everything you want to know.

The data were stored in the Boston office. There were multiple sections to the instrument and we color coded them so they could be grouped together for analysis.”

They also gave insight into what the biggest methodological hurdles can be in a research project, again by taking an example from the Mindhunter project:

“The biggest hurdle was being able to collect complete data to answer the research questions. We needed to verify what was learned from the interview with what was recorded in records. The agents had access to prison records. Of course, there was new
information learned and then that had to be reconciled with whether the agent thought the subject’s answer was truthful”.

Gísli Guðjónsson gave insight into the process of a research project to explain the methodological considerations and how they relate to legal and ethical considerations:

“This first pick a subject that is important, something that fills a gap in the field and is doable. The planning stage is very important, so as to not invalidate the study at later stages. Look at the research question and what it is you want an answer to and then pick a relevant method, devise interviews, questionnaires, make clinical tests etc. Write the research, get content feedback and then publish for additional feedback. It is important to be very thorough, understand the subject and all aspects of it, but respect the boundaries, especially the legal and ethical boundaries”.

4.2.4 Summary of themes and project phases
Analyzing all the information and data given by the four experts interviewed, some of which was listed above, made it possible to put together the critical considerations for each phase in a sensitive research project as seen in table 6. First on the initiation phase of the project, the overall planning and execution, and finally on the closure phase.
# Table 6. Critical considerations and project phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>01 Initiation</th>
<th>02 Planning</th>
<th>03 Execution</th>
<th>04 Close-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td>Map out relevant legal regulators / authorities and guidelines.</td>
<td>The test instrument must be designed to prevent identification of the subject’s data.</td>
<td>Inform the subject that if a new crime is disclosed, you will have to report it and are not able to grant any concessions for participation in the research.</td>
<td>Collected data must be aggregated for all publications/reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a proposal and get IRB approval for collecting data, unless you are doing a secondary analysis on an existing data set.</td>
<td>Write a consent form for research subjects and get IRB approval</td>
<td>The subjects needs to sign a consent form that has been approved by an IRB.</td>
<td>Get final IRB approval, if needed, before publishing research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a consent form for research subjects and get IRB approval</td>
<td>Find a secure storage facility for test instrument with minimal number of persons having access to the location.</td>
<td>Respect regulations regarding time lengths of interviews and at what time of day they take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical</strong></td>
<td>Consider and list ethical implications of research topic and project.</td>
<td>Set up security protocols that ensure protection and privacy of the research subjects. In the submission to the IRB, outline how risk to the subject is minimized when participating in the research project.</td>
<td>Be careful not to discuss project information with others outside the project as it could result in breach of confidentiality.</td>
<td>Protect anonymity of research subjects in all publications and discussions about the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish connection to IRBs</td>
<td>Ensure that the research team understands the sensitivity of the project and potential risks involved (psychological and/or physical).</td>
<td>Individual subject information should never be discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decide authorship of research.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect should be given to the answers provided by subjects, regardless of the team’s feeling about the content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological</strong></td>
<td>Identify research topic and question.</td>
<td>Quality of data is critical. The power of the sample size needs to be adequate to meet the objectives.</td>
<td>It is optimal to send two people to perform interviews with subjects, both for safety and higher quality of data collection.</td>
<td>Review the instrument for additional items and remove questions that are redundant or not useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set up clear and achievable objectives designed to answer the research question and/or to test a hypothesis.</td>
<td>Be mindful of the pressure on the subject to answer questions and the length of the interviews. Short, in-depth answers will often provide the best yield of data.</td>
<td>After each interview, assemble the team to discuss the interview; enter the data into the instrument and make notes.</td>
<td>The team participates in the interpretation of the data for written publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of staff with prior experience in sensitive research projects is optimal.</td>
<td>Pilot test the questions and instruments to be used in a project.</td>
<td>Regular team meetings (individual and group) to keep motivation high. All team members need to feel that they are contributing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not promise more research subjects than you can realistically find.</td>
<td>You cannot predict what might go wrong once the project starts, but typically problems come from ambiguity in objects or the testing instrument.</td>
<td>Be mindful that the subject’s answers might not always be truthful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Organization and process map

The data analysis produced a holistic overview of all the key concepts, e.g. project management, criminal and forensic psychology and sensitive research projects and key themes, e.g. legal, ethical and methodological considerations of the research question. With this information, a typical organizational chart was constructed (figure 2), showing relationships and relative ranks of its parts and positions.

![Organizational Chart](image)

**Figure 2. Organizational chart for sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology**

The overall analysis of the data also made it possible to put together a detailed process map, as seen in figure 3, for sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology. The process map shows the work processes and how all the inputs and tasks are linked together in a project from start to finish in a sequential order.
Figure 3. Basic process map of sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology
5. Discussion

5.1 The research results

Various literature in the theoretical areas of both criminal and forensic psychology has been published, but most of it offers limited insight into the possible project management process behind it. With this qualitative study, a connection can be made to the project management field. The results show that, in sensitive research projects, knowledge in project management is very important and possibly just as important as the theoretical knowledge, for the project to become successful. There are high stakes in these kinds of projects, with very specific legal, ethical and methodological considerations to be taken into account. The results give a holistic overview of the process involved in managing these kinds of projects, as outlined in detail in the process map (see figure 3).

The main limitation of the data analysis was the ability to reach enough experts to sample. As previously stated, the research area has a limited number of experts, but though the quantity may have been lacking, the quality was not. All the experts interviewed have extensive experience in the field and could offer valuable new insights into the research question of this thesis.

5.2. Management considerations

When interviewing the experts, there was clear emphasis from all of them on the importance of team structure. It was interesting to see how diversified the skills have to be for the research project to be successful (see table 4), as the research projects have become more and more complicated, with a more global and complex research environment. Equally important is the project manager’s role in motivating the team and keeping them engaged with the project. It shows that the project manager has to incorporate both “hard” and “soft” skills, as discussed by Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess.

The data analysis showed that there are three categories of stakeholders in sensitive research projects (see table 5). This stakeholder analysis gives insight for project managers, with which to better identify the key players in the project and decide which considerations are appropriate for each one. After speaking to the experts, it was clear that among the most important stakeholders are the Institutional Review Boards, as their approval is the deciding factor on the outcome of the project. This is also apparent in literature about qualitative researches that are sensitive in nature.

5.3 Legal, ethical, methodological considerations

Both literature and data results from the qualitative interviews show that there is not a clear line between what are considered to be legal and what are considered to be ethical matters, as they are very intertwined and dependent on each other. All the experts interviewed expressed the importance of protecting the privacy of the research subjects. Breach of confidentiality
would be a class action lawsuit waiting to happen and would invalidate the study. This shows how important it is to store the data in a secure way. This is not only a legal requirement, but also an ethical one. Anonymity is crucial for the safety of the research subjects and their families, as well as the research team itself. Therefore, it was repeatedly mentioned that everyone on the research team had to be well aware of all legal and ethical guidelines and protocols of the project.

Another interesting insight was the importance of compassion and empathy for the data collected. It is important not to let personal feelings affect the data analysis, but instead to keep the objective and outcome in sight and be empathetic to the data being collected. This can prove to be difficult in especially challenging cases where information given goes against the morality of the researcher. Authorship was something that both Ann, Allen and Gísli mentioned as an important legal and ethical consideration, and one can conclude that the decision on authorship should be addressed at the beginning of the project. The main considerations regarding methodology were linked to quality and storing of data. The link between success of the project and quality of the data is undeniable. For example, the simple matter of the test instruments length is important, as Drs. Ann and Allen advised. A too complicated and/or long instrument will affect the yield of the data. That will also affect the sample size that needs to meet the requirements of the research objectives. There was also a great insight about the “flexibility”, or lack of it, in sensitive research projects. Everything is tied to the IRB’s review, and after their approval nothing can be changed in the methodology and little in the project plan, otherwise new approval is needed. Any changes or additions to the project must go back for IRB review, which could delay the project and put the research outcome at risk.

In every project there are hurdles to overcome and sensitive research projects are no different, although some of them are slightly different in nature. For example, one big hurdle can be opposition to a specific research, or “hostiles”, that will try to limit access to data or stop the research from happening for a variety of reasons. Also, getting permission from a subject to publish can be difficult, even though anonymity is assured, or even just collecting enough data to answer the research question.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to investigate - What are the critical, legal, ethical and methodological considerations when managing sensitive research projects in criminal and forensic psychology? Because of the nature of these projects, the stakes are high, and that is why it is critical to ensure minimal risk and the best outcome for everyone involved. To answer this question and gain insights for the field of project management, special attention was given to three themes that give sensitive research projects boundaries and structure; legal, ethical and methodological. The results show that there are numerous considerations regarding the themes, and that the technical know-how in project management is an important skill for a research director to have. In the future, it would be interesting to do a test case, where a sensitive research project would be carried out formally, using project management tools and then analyzing the outcome. This study has generated four tools that can be of use to project managers in sensitive research projects; Team structure guidelines, stakeholder analysis,
critical considerations in the key themes in all project phases, and a detailed process map that lists all tasks that are involved in the project sequentially from start to finish. It is also beneficial to take note of the insights given by the experts interviewed, as their experience is extensive - in particular the advice of Drs. Ann and Allen Burgess to future project managers who are starting a sensitive research project, “Identify your topic, select your team, be sure you have a content expert and mentors, and identify your stakeholders”. Not that different from a traditional project at all.
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