Books on Research Ethics

The increasing importance of research ethics has led to a surge in the activities of research ethics boards in universities. So we became interested in the idea of publishing a set of reviews devoted to books on this area. We scanned our sources for what was available and identified three books that we believed might be of interest to the journal’s readers. As always, publishers were most cooperative, and we were fortunate to have the books reviewed by individuals who have considerable experience in ethics and research:

Derek Truscott is a member of the Research Ethics Board of the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Mary Maguire is Chair of the Education Research Ethics Board, McGill University.

Michael McDonald holds the Maurice Young Chair of Applied Ethics in the W. Maurice Young Centre for Applied Ethics, University of British Columbia.
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Fieldwork, Participation and Practice: Ethics and Dilemmas in Qualitative Research,

I was very excited to have the opportunity to read this book. The ethics of qualitative field research is an area of scholarship that is worthy of greater discussion. Unfortunately, I was disappointed by Fieldwork, Participation and Practice. In the Introduction, de Laine sets out the aims of the text as promoting an understanding of the harmful possibilities of fieldwork, and fostering ways to deal with ethical and practical dilemmas. While de Laine does an adequate job of meeting the first of these aims, the reader will likely feel let down (as I was) regarding the second. At very least, Fieldwork could benefit from a preface that sets out the intended audience and purpose of the book.

De Laine’s central argument is that ethical dilemmas in field research are both unavoidable and unanticipated. There may be some truth to these assertions, but many ethical scholars would take exception with them (as do I) and de Laine does not adequately defend them. Moreover, my primary criticism of this book is that it lacks a coherent framework or ethical
system to guide the reader or to hold the text together. Indeed, it is very difficult to extract the essential points of this text. The reader is provided with much opinion and, admittedly, stimulating ideas, but is left with little, if any, guidance.

Applied ethics, whether in field research or any other endeavour, should not necessarily contain anything that is ethically peculiar or unique. They should be nothing more than a particularized version of a universal ethical system or code, where the particulars are a function of the nature of the activities unique to that application. Applied ethics do not indicate that different ethical principles apply to the particular activities. Rather, they indicate that those undertaking such activities have a distinct expertise or face difficult situations that require higher-than-normal levels of ethical responsibility. Applied ethics, therefore, should be the application of general ethical principles to specific activities. These principles should be derived from a defensible ethical system.

Qualitative field research is certainly an activity that presents difficult situations for which the ethically appropriate course of action is not necessarily obvious. And it is here, in relation to the first aim of the book—to promote an understanding of the harmful possibilities of fieldwork—where Fieldwork, Participation and Practice delivers. Many actual and possible dilemmas are described that will be of great help for new and experienced researchers. Betrayal as unethical seems to be the central harmful possibility highlighted in this book, and is certainly an important ethical problem that is particularly salient in qualitative field research. Unfortunately, de Laine focuses primarily on threats to the validity of fieldwork research and to the well-being of the researcher. While these are very important topics, they are not ethical topics. Ethics are about protecting others from harm.

De Laine argues that “traditional,” “objective” ethical systems avoid many of the issues that the qualitative fieldwork researcher is faced with, and that feminist ethics do a better job of acknowledging them. Fair enough; there is certainly merit to this criticism, but Fieldwork, Participation and Practice does not sufficiently articulate a system of feminist ethics that would provide the reader with the means to resolve the dilemmas presented. De Laine even goes so far as to state that “Feminist ethics [are] not well codified” (p. 111) and “Codes are not enough because you must make a decision” (p. 144). I cannot agree with this position; the feminist ethical system is well developed and does provide much useful guidance. Indeed, de Laine rejects most accepted ethical principles, referring, for example, to the “abstract ethical principle of informed consent” (p. 89). Informed consent is abstract? The reader is given no justification for such remarks. De Laine appears to be challenging existing ethical systems without presenting an alternative, while at the same time attempting to foster ways of dealing with ethical dilemmas. Fieldwork, Participation and Practice shows that this cannot be done.

De Laine’s second argument is that personal characteristics such as empathy and sympathy, as well as intuitive judgments, are sufficient for resolving ethical dilemmas. Instead of ethical principles, de Laine urges the researcher to “draw on their own intuition and feelings which ask, ‘Would I like this done to me?’” (p. 136), “Not say things in print you would not say to the people themselves” (p. 191), “If it does not feel right there is a problem and if in doubt, leave out” (p. 198), and, “Does this feel right?” (p. 190). While these are noble sentiments, no justification is given for them. And, of course, such advice is open to the counter-argument; what if you are a cruel person and it feels right to harm another?

Intuitive judgments, by definition, are spontaneous and emotional without any clear conscious decision-making. Intuitive ethical judgment is based upon a lifetime of learning about being moral, of which training and experience in ethics and standards may constitute only a very small part. In ideal circumstances, it predisposes researchers to act in ethically appropriate ways and leads to sound ethical choices. In ambiguous or confusing
situations, however, intuitive judgment may not lead to desirable choices because it is highly individual and subject to personal bias. Ultimately, intuitive ethical judgments cannot serve as justification for our actions. It is only through repeated experience with the application of a defensible ethical system (which feminist ethics certainly is) that we are able to develop and articulate personal ethical decisions that are both intuitive and defensible.

Fieldwork, Participation and Practice addresses a much-needed area in ethics scholarship and the author should be applauded for doing so. Unfortunately, it falls short of meeting at least one of its two intended aims. Perhaps de Laine should decide if the book is a guide to credible, safe, or ethical qualitative research, or if it is a critique of existing ethical systems, and focus the text accordingly. As it stands, Fieldwork, Participation and Practice is appropriate as a supplementary text in a graduate course on qualitative research, and should be of interest to researchers well versed in qualitative theory and philosophy.
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Situated Ethics in Educational Research is an excellent, timely, and very useful book about rethinking our understanding of ethics, applied ethical issues, researchers' ethical roles, responsibilities, dilemmas, and discursive practices. With an impressive multidisciplinary collection of papers, it accomplishes its aims: (a) to challenge universal ethical principles and rigid codes, (b) to explore how ethical issues are conceptualized, differently and discursively handled and mediated by researchers in different fields, and (c) to understand how ethics is constructed and situated in complex sociopolitical contexts. The authors in this volume target Cartesian dualisms of mind–body, cognition–emotion, and individual–social that have structured our thinking about ethics and influenced ethical decision making for so long. The authors draw on feminist and postmodern theories to expose the assumptions entrenched in these binary oppositions. In this way, the oppositions are replaced with a view of ethics as situated and immune to universalization. This is ironic at a time when we see a proliferation of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and Research Ethics Boards (REBs) that aim to standardize ethical policies and procedures and to develop ethical codes or standards among occupational groups.

This book belongs to an emerging genre of texts that argue for alternative explanations of complex phenomenon (e.g., situated cognition, situated literacy practices, communities of practice) and against essentialist, foundational theories of mainstream educational research. The editors explicitly acknowledge that they have a particular philosophical and political stance that is shared, in varying degrees, by all the contributors. However, it is
Micro ethics and qualitative research. The bioethical framework of procedural ethics is based on a principle led form of reductive and deductive reasoning which lacks social salience and does not relate to the exigencies of research in real world settings[9, 22, 29, 30, 41, 42, 45, 85, 95, 96]. Corrigan[43] characterizes the outcome of such procedures as â€œempty ethicsâ€™. Within the bioethical paradigm, research participation should be voluntary and based on fully informed consent. However, in qualitative research transparency of purpose and of method is not always easy to achieve. The literature on how researchers have dealt with such dilemmas in practice reveals the nature of â€œethicalâ€™ decisions to be grounded in the particularity of contexts and situations[129, 130, 133, 134]. Transparency in Qualitative Research: An Overview of Key Findings and Implications of the Deliberations. SSRN Electronic Journal, CrossRef. â€œEthics, Informed Consent, and Fieldwork.â€ Journal of Anthropological Research 36 (3): 274â€“86. Ellis, Carolyn. â€œEthics and Politics of Field Research in South Africa.â€ Social Problems 37 (3): 329â€“40. González-López, Gloria. 2011. â€œMindful Ethics: Comments on Informant-Centered Practices in Sociological Research.â€ Qualitative Sociology 34 (3): 447â€“61. Gray, Bradford H. 1975. Fieldwork, Participation and Practice: Ethics and Dilemmas in Qualitative Research. Marlene de Laine. Sage Publications (2000). Abstract. This timely and topical look at the role of ethics in fieldwork takes into account some of the major issues confronting qualitative researchers. The main purposes of this book are twofold: to promote an understanding of the harmful possibilities of fieldwork; and to provide ways of dealing with ethical problems and dilemmas. To these ends, examples of actual fieldwork are provided that address ethical problems and dilemmas, and posit ways of dealing with the