Ethical Guidelines for Community/Ecological Fieldwork & Research

Mary Watkins

Doing community/ecological fieldwork[1] and research raise important ethical concerns that need to be anticipated in the planning of fieldwork/research, and navigated with integrity during each stage of fieldwork and/or research. Ethical guidelines for research in psychology were first developed for positivisitic methodologies that involved separations between researcher and "subject"[2] and between "subject" and his/her context, a hierarchical relation of expert to object of study, an exporting of knowledge from experimental situations to academic ones, and a control of meanings by the researcher (see Lincoln, 1990; Mishler, 1986). The issue of a power differential between the researcher and the researched was not thematized or understood to be ethically problematic.

Depth psychologically inspired ecological and cultural work[3] is more akin to anthropological fieldwork than to mainstream psychological research in that it begins with an attempt to join the context being studied, encouraging participation and relationship, rather than distance, between fieldworker and those in the context being entered. It is interested in the multiple meanings given to situations by members of the community. It has an ear for narrative and image, and is open to movement that comes from both the telling of how something is and imagining that reaches into what is desired. Research stemming from fieldwork must grapple with the degree of involvement of those being studied with the formulation of research questions, the gathering and analysis of data, and the dissemination of findings. As has been amply documented in anthropology, work that grounds itself in relationship presents ethical dilemmas not ordinarily encountered in more positivistic research. For instance, feelings of having been betrayed

---

[1] The use of the term "fieldwork" is borrowed from anthropology and should signal us to explore some of the ethical concerns faced by anthropologists since the early 1970's. Anthropology initially flourished from an unequal power encounter between the West and the Third World (Levi-Strauss, 1967: Asad, 1973). In a colonial context anthropology gave "the West access to cultural and historical information about the societies it has progressively dominated" (Asad, 1973, p. 16). The structure of its research has meant that many of the knowings it derived flowed back not to the societies studied but to the funding sources of these studies and to the academy. This limited the extent to which anthropology could produce subversive forms of understanding (Asad, 1973, p. 17). Post-modern anthropology has attempted to look at this shadow of fieldwork and to tentatively explore a more participatory form of ethics that is grounded in the kinds of concerns brought up in these guidelines (see American Anthropological Association, 1998).

[2] Etymologically "subject" comes from the Latin *subjugare* which means to be under the yoke of, whereas "respondent" carries the sense of being able to speak to or reply to the situation one is in.

[3] According to Belenky, Bond &Weinstock(1997) "cultural worker" is a term first used by African-American women community workers in the Deep South, such as Jane Sapp and others at the Center for Cultural and Community Development, who were dedicated to cultivating the arts and leadership traditions of the African diaspora to strengthen "and draw out the voices of the people and uplift the whole community" (p. 10). In *A Tradition That Has No Name: Nurturing the Development of People, Families, and Communities* Belenky et al extend the term cultural work to describe community work that turns its attentions to the margins of society, listening into voice what has been silenced, attending to the articulation of the knowledge and vision within a community, fostering the arts as a means to both represent lived reality and to dream past it into desired visions.

or deserted may arise when the researcher withdraws from the community and/or is seen to use the research primarily for his/her own academic advancement, rather than for the benefit of those studied.

As a student at Pacifica Graduate Institute you will be asked to fulfill ethical procedures that are consistent with those of the American Psychological Association when conducting research with animal and/or human subjects. Beyond the fulfillment of these basic requirements, you are also being asked to deeply host considerations of the ethical nature of your fieldwork involvement and research at each of its stages. Faculty and fellow students should be used to explore and provoke ethical questions about your work, helping you to integrate a sense of ethics into the heart of your work.

To these ends, the next section will present ethical principles in large part derived from the American Psychological Association's ethical standards, and then a process approach to ethical questions and concerns at each stage of fieldwork and research.

Ethical Guidelines for Research

Respect for Persons

Individuals must be treated as free and autonomous. This means that participants must freely agree (in writing) to participate in your study with no coercion or harmful consequence should they elect not to participate. Participants must also be free to end their participation in your study at any stage during its development.

Participants with diminished capacity must also be respected and protected. The ability for self-determination can become limited due to illness, mental disability, or physical circumstances. Therefore, investigators must protect the welfare of people who participate in their research. This includes maintaining confidentiality in terms of their participation and the data collected from their participation.

Beneficence

Beneficence means not harming the participant physically, emotionally or psychologically, and fulfills the Hippocratic oath "Do no harm" (See Types of Harm, below). The investigator needs to maximize the benefit and minimize any harm or risk to the participants in the study.

Justice

The principle of justice applies to the population that you choose for your study. You should not choose a population just because they are easily available, in a compromised position, or because they are open to manipulation. The burden for research should be fairly distributed and related to the problem being studied. In addition, participants have a right to know the purpose of the research. Thus, truthfulness, at least at the post-experiment interview, is a necessary ingredient in your research design.

Integrity

You must be forthright in describing to your participants the nature of your research, spelling out the duration and nature of your relationship with them. Further, you must treat the data you gather honestly, only drawing from it those conclusions that can be legitimately justified.

Summary Considerations

Types of Harm

It is difficult to ensure that absolutely no harm will come to participants in a psychological study. For this reason, it is absolutely essential that the Informed Consent form (as well as your application) state honestly any possible psychological and/or physical risk (see example).

Harm may be considered in the following categories:

a) **Physical harm**: Whereas obvious physical risks may be minimized or eliminated, sometimes more subtle physical risks go undetected. For example:
    - -- Any study involving physical activity (such as dance therapy) may create a possible environment for physical injury.
    - -- Projects involving more physically demanding activity such as a wilderness experience present considerable risk, as well as difficulties if subjects wish to withdraw from the study. Studies involving such strenuous activity and/or geographical isolation are not recommended.
    - -- Activities such as painting may present subtle risks if, for example, work space is not well ventilated. Any activity involving potentially toxic materials must be assessed for risk.

b) **Stress**: Possible psychological stress needs to be clearly assessed. Probing questions can cause considerable discomfort; certain topics may generate embarrassment or discomfort; psychological issues and painful memories may be reactivated. The documentation that you present to the participants must accurately reflect these considerations.

c) **Use of patients as research subjects**: In most cases, the Institute recommends against the use of patients for research purposes when such research would take place concurrent with a therapeutic relationship. Such a situation can constitute a dual relationship—that of researcher and psychotherapist. The use of past or terminating patients for research presents less difficulty. Nevertheless, care must be taken that consent is indeed freely given, and that the pursuit of research does not harm the therapeutic relationship. At all times the researcher must maintain an awareness of the potential impact on the patient and on the transference situation, which may extend beyond termination. Students should consult with their advisor on gaining approval for research projects that involve current or past patients.

Case material that is used in such a manner that the patient may recognize as their own experience always requires the need for informed consent. Quoting directly from the patient, or using dream images or narratives necessitates informed consent. The use of case material should be discussed with your advisor and the dissertation coordinator as a part of the ethics approval process. Of course, measures to conceal the identity of the patient must be employed.

d) **Breach of confidentiality**: When you are working with a small community that is to be named or which could be easily identifiable in your writing, be mindful that personal identities will be easily deduced unless extreme care has been taken to disguise them. Embarrassment and other serious kinds of harm can come to respondents when their privacy is dismantled by others being able to attribute to them thoughts and actions they prefer to have remain private. One safeguard against such harm is to allow your respondents to read and approve any writing you may do that characterizes them.

At times researchers find themselves in the unsavory position of choosing between the harm caused by revealing something unfavorable about a situation or a community and the potential "good" to be gained by doing so. Such a dilemma should be addressed with others, not alone. The way we characterize others in our writings, even when anonymity has been preserved, can be a source of hurt and anger. Even if you are not allowing your respondents to read your dissertation, read it carefully yourself as though you were each of them and feel your way into how it would impact them were they to read it and were they to know others had read it. Many times researchers have made the unfortunate miscalculation that their respondents would never read their research about them.

Where confidentiality has been promised, the researcher must be sure that he/she has sufficiently disguised any material used so that the identity of the research participants is concealed from their community and from anyone who might know of them or come to know of them.

e) **Failure to give credit to respondents who want their words to be attributed to them:** Most research respondents want to know their anonymity will be safeguarded. On some occasions, however, the presumption of anonymity reinscribes the asymmetry of power in the research relationship, where authorship goes to the researcher and anonymity to the researched. Let your respondents know that they have a choice in this manner, thinking through with them any potential downsides to themselves regarding disclosure of identity.

f) **Coercion**: It is not ethical to willfully mislead the participant as to the nature of the experiment/study. Thus, any form of **trickery or manipulation** in order to produce a particular result/response is a violation of ethical principles. Over recent decades, ethical considerations in research have shifted in affirming this sensibility.
This principle does not necessitate that you disclose every detail of the study. When you are seeking to understand a particular phenomenon you can simply state what that phenomenon is and that you are exploring this phenomenon and looking at many issues.

g) **Failure to sufficiently inform and and/or to obtain informed consent**

Students must comply with the following APA ethical guidelines:
(a) "When obtaining informed consent as required in Standard 3.10, Informed Consent, psychologists inform participants about (1) the purpose of the research, expected duration, and procedures; (2) their right to decline to participate and to withdraw from the research once participation has begun; (3) the foreseeable consequences of declining or withdrawing; (4) reasonably foreseeable factors that may be expected to influence their willingness to participate such as potential risks, discomfort, or adverse effects; (5) any prospective research benefits; (6) limits of confidentiality; (7) incentives for participation; and (8) whom to contact for questions about the research and research participants' rights. They provide opportunity for the prospective participants to ask questions and receive answers. (See also Standards 8.03, Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research; 8.05, Dispensing With Informed Consent for Research; and 8.07, Deception in Research.)"

Ethical Considerations at Each Stage of Fieldwork and Research

The ethical dilemmas that often surface in qualitative research are not put to rest by scrupulous adherence to the standard procedures for informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality. "Who owns the data?" is an ethical question that participants in laboratory studies do not think to ask. Whose interpretation counts? Who has veto power? What will happen to the relationships that were formed in the field? What are the researcher's obligations after the data are collected? Can the data be used against the participants? Will the data be used on their behalf? Do researchers have an obligation to protect the communities and social groups they study or just to guard the rights of individuals? These kinds of questions reveal how much ethical terrain is uncharted by APA guidelines, IRB reviews, and the like. It is qualitative researchers who are wrestling with such ethical dilemmas, but these dilemmas are present in much psychological research, regardless of its methodological commitments. (Maracek, Fine & Kidder, 1997, p. 641)

Any qualitative researcher who is not asleep ponders moral and ethical questions: Is my project really worth doing? Do people really understand what they are getting into? Am I exploiting people with my "innocent questions? What about their privacy? Do respondents have a right to see my report? Why good is anonymity if people and their colleagues can easily recognize themselves in a case study? When they do, might it hurt or damage them in some way? What do I do if I observe harmful cases? Who will benefit and who will lose as a result of my study? Who owns the data, and who owns the report? The qualitative literature is full of rueful testimony on such questions, peppered with sentences beginning with "I never expected..." and "If only I had known that..." and "I only belatedly realized that..." We need to attend more to the ethics of what we are planning and doing. As Mirvis and Seashore (1982) say, "Naiveté [about ethics] itself is unethical" (p. 100). (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 288)

As you can see, this section is mainly oriented around sets of queries that will help to discern and work through possible ethical problems in your fieldwork and/or research. Rather than state an abstract set of principles, I have tried to capture the dynamic questioning and response that characterizes an ethical approach to fieldwork and research. Such questioning is best accomplished in the company of others, to allow the work to be viewed from different perspectives. We encourage you to work with these queries with your fellow students, your fieldwork and research advisor, and faculty generally. As you design your work, draw up alongside of it an ethical protocol, that thematizes and systematically addresses the ethical issues at various stages of your work. Update this periodically as you negotiate the ethical dilemmas your work presents.

I. Negotiating entrance into a community

Most fieldwork begins with a desire to learn about a particular community. The ethical principle of beneficence immediately appears. Who is this entrance into a community for? Does your participation have the possibility of benefiting only yourself or also the community you are approaching? Does your intrusion into a community carry possibilities of harm? How are you attending to these possibilities? Are you being clear about your purpose(s) with members of the community, i.e., have you fully informed them? Have they extended an invitation to you with full knowledge of how you understand your participation? Have you been clear about the limits of your participation in terms of time spent there, duration of stay, duties being taken on? Are you mindful of potential dependency on you that may arise and be difficult to responsibly handle when you exit the community? Some researchers have implicitly entered into seemingly close relationships with respondents in order to obtain better data, confusing respondents about the nature of the relationship. Can you be mindful of any ways you are subtly or overtly misrepresenting the nature of your relationship with your respondents?

II. Issues of Social Justice

If, in the course of your research, you witness suffering, violence, extreme poverty, or degradation of status, does your witnessing of these events bring with it any obligations toward the community in the way of addressing these conditions? Even if you have done no harm, and have treated members of the community with proper ethical consideration, is your engagement with this community terminated when you have collected all of your fieldwork data? What are the ethical obligations you incur through witness? Will any of your research be used to oppress or undermine the community you write about as happened to many studied by anthropologists and area studies scholars after WWII? Many contemporary researchers are finding that they struggle with these questions even if they have few clearcut answers. This discernment is part of an ethical approach to fieldwork.

III. Formulation of work in the community

Has your formulation of the work you will do in the community been informed by dialogue and participation with members of that community? Have you determined in advance what you think the community needs or wants and are entering to deliver your understanding? Or are you able to apprentice yourself to the context and allow your own pre-understandings to be challenged, negated, corroborated, or complexified by your dialogue with others and your witnessing of the situation? Are you greeting your work and witnessing with a flexibility that allows your early definitions to shift as your participation evolves in concert with others in your setting? Paulo Freire (1970) asks us to reflect on whether the work we do mirrors our dream for a community or the community's dream for itself.

Do you have the competence to pursue the work you are outlining, or are there steps you need to take (supervision, training in research skills, foreign language study, adequate time in the particular field site, etc.) to increase your competence to adequately take on the work you are proposing (Miles & Huberman, 1994)?

IV. Construction of research question(s)

Research questions can be located on a continuum from those that are centrally important to the researcher and minimally to others in a community to those questions which have central importance to the researcher and to the community. If the research question(s) has arisen from your own private and personal experience, dialogue with others is necessary to see how their experience may or may not overlap with the researcher's, and to find the terms of inquiry that are general enough to capture experience beyond, yet alongside, the researcher's own. The researcher needs to confront whether or not the topic is idiosyncratic to themselves, and whether or not they have failed to frame it in terms that go beyond their own specific circumstance.

One way to avoid these dilemmas from the beginning is to allow research questions to arise through dialogue with a community. This is a formal part of participatory research, but can be implemented in various forms of research, both quantitative and qualitative. What are the questions that the community itself has and would like to explore through research? Is the research project of possible benefit to the co-researchers and their community or does the benefit go entirely to the researchers and others? Such considerations move us from gaining "informed consent" to a study we have thought up on our own to engaging in a collaborative process of generating with others in the community the questions and procedures to be used in the research.

V. Selection of participants for research

Are the participants selected to mirror the experience of the researcher or to challenge and extend the understandings of the researcher? In a similar vein, has there been care to select participants who live within the "margin" as it is constituted by the research project? Bat-Ami Bar On argues that it is not simply a case that all knowledge is perspectival, but that some perspectives are more revealing than others; namely, those that have been socially marginalized (1993). Patricia Hill-Collins (1991) stresses that the 'outsider within' is more likely to see and challenge the knowledge claims of insiders, have greater objectivity, and an ability to see patterns insiders are too immersed to see. Are you stretching your comfort zone to speak with those who are most likely to disagree with your pre-assumptions and understandings? Can you ask yourself who would be most challenging for you to speak with and to wonder why? Are you "willing to engage the variety of standpoints that exist in any single context?" (Maracek, Fine, Kidder, 1987, p. 641)

VI. Informed Consent

Have you explained face-to-face and in written format the goals and procedures of your research in a way that your respondent can easily understand? Have you been clear about all the potential audiences of your work? Have you carefully thought through with others the possible harm that could come from this work and have you discussed this clearly with your respondents? Are you obtaining informed consent for your own safeguarding and fulfilling of academic requirements or are you also entering the full spirit of "informed consent," discussing the work with your respondents so that they will be able to choose freely about their participation and the extent of their participation.

If, during the course of the study, your agenda regarding the research or fieldwork diverges from what you originally told your participants, have you taken steps to update them and gain their consent for your new intentions, procedures, goals, and any changes in intended audience? Such renegotiation is usually necessary in ongoing fieldwork and research.

In what ways might your respondent(s) not be free to choose non-participation. For instance, does he/she fear (perhaps rightly so!) a change in the nature of the relationship with you if the decision is not to participate? Have you been clear about whether respondents have veto power over aspects pertaining to them in your final report? Can they submit a different interpretation of data relating to them, if they disagree with yours?

VII. Confidentiality

Most respondents want to know that their anonymity will be safeguarded. On some occasions, however, the offer of anonymity reinscribes the asymmetry of power in the research relationship, where authorship goes to the researcher and anonymity to the researched. This has been a perpetual, hegemonic outcome of colonial, Western research that has applied power to take the community's knowledge, cultural assets, and resources away without caring for giving it back to them. Smith (2012) has referred to this tendency of making knowledge out of the usurped knowledge of researched Indigenous communities "traveller tales," that are told under the same ethnocentric frameworks of Western, colonial researchers, and thus are no more than misrepresented and appropriated tales told about them to a larger "universal audience." Let your respondents know that they have a choice to disclose or not information, thinking through with them any potential downsides and negative impacts to themselves regarding disclosure of identity and their ways of knowing.

When you are working with a small community that is to be named or easily identified in your writing, be mindful that personal identities will be easily deduced unless extreme care has been taken to disguise them. Embarrassment and other serious kinds of harm can come to respondents when their privacy is dismantled by others being able to attribute to them thoughts and actions they prefer to have remain private. One safeguard against such harm is to allow your respondents to read and approve any writing you may do that characterizes them. If participants agree to publish the knowledge generated in the research process, make sure to discuss plans for dissemination if the community wishes to pursue it as a strategy for their own community well-being, such as co-authoring the generated knowledge in the form of, for example, journal articles, books, policy briefs, videos, photographs, or other type of artistic products. Permission to disclose or share information and its purpose and use should be received from participants prior to engagement in research by means of culturally appropriate, informed consent that warrants confidentiality or acceptance to use their names and authorship for the mutually agreed purposes.

At times researchers have found themselves in the unsavory position of choosing between the harm caused by revealing something unfavorable about a person or a community and the potential "good" to be gained by doing so. Such a dilemma should be addressed with others, not alone. The way we characterize communities and their participants in our writing, even when anonymity has been preserved, can be a source of and a cause for hurt and anger. Even if you are not allowing your respondents to read your research report, read it carefully yourself as though you were each of them and feel your way in to how it would impact them were they to read it and were they to know others had read it. Many times researchers have made the unfortunate miscalculation that their respondents would never read writings about them.

Important guiding principles for the use of Indigenous methods have been developed by many Indigenous psychologists. For example, Filipino psychologists proposed the use of *Kapwa* (shared identity, fellow human being), emphasizing the need to treat research participants as equals, placing the welfare of participants as more important than data gathering and the need to use culturally appropriate methods that adapt to existing cultural norms (Pe-Pua, 2006). Wilson (2008) proposed awareness of interdependent relationships among humans, other than humans, and nature as the main guiding ethical value that views research as ceremony and a sacred celebration. Lastly, Indigenous researchers demand that the language of the people should be the language of the research at all times (Kim et al., 2006; Smith, 2012).

Under indigenous research, knowledge is viewed as praxis, relationship building, developing shared identity and interdependence, as well as raising critical consciousness. Multi-methods are applied to enhance awareness of one-with-the-other. The researcher co-constructs knowledge in relationship with others and gives it back to the community. The problem definition is co-constructed in the culture itself; the issue must be present in their cultural awareness or created through involvement on the basis of respectful identification with the Indigenous culture. In regards to ethical issues, manipulation and “drive-by research” (meaning they come, they take, they go), as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) called it, is avoided at all times. Results remain in the community and the participants decide what to do with them. Indigenous scholars contest the dominant Western research as colonizing etic approaches imposed on Indigenous cultures. In contrast, Indigenous psychologies are based on an indigenization from within process, obtaining emic data from diverse cultural groups and developing, collaboratively, shared knowledge that is transformative and is applied to co-create healing and sacred spaces (Ciofalo,2015).

VIII. Selection of Interviewers

Has consideration been given to whom the participant(s) is most likely to feel comfortable with, and to be open and communicative? Is there provision for follow-up regarding the participant's assessment of the effect of the identity of the interviewer on the content of the interview? How do gender, ethnic, racial and other differences affect the particular interviewing situation?

Is the interviewer ready to be moved and changed by the conversation with the co-researcher or does she retreat into a position of pseudo-objectivity and detachment? Is she a vulnerable observer (Behar, 1996) and participant? Is the interviewer capable of partial identification? Has she placed herself alongside those she wishes to understand sufficiently to make such a partial identification, as well as been capable of witnessing and learning from the differences from herself that the other poses? The validity of a study is increased when one ensures that participants feel at ease to talk freely and deeply about their experience and understandings. Attention should be given to where the interviews and discussions take place with the aim of putting participants at ease, while freeing them from distractions.

IX. Collecting of data

How are participants engaged in dialogue such as interviews, storytelling, conversations that co-construct knowledge with a researcher [N1] ? Are they only able to respond to how the researcher has cast the experience within his/her questions (as in responding to a highly structured questionnaire), or is the dialogue open enough for the participants' structuration of the experience to emerge? Mishler(1986) asked if the interviewer allows the lived context of the respondent to come fully into the interview situation. Or is the experience of the interview more akin to a "degradation ceremony" (Garfinkel, 1950) or an "identity-stripping process" (Goffman, 1961)?

Ann Oakley (1981) suggested respondents be allowed to "talk back," viewing the interview as an interactional exchange. The respondent, if fully informed about the purposes of the research, may be able to address the kinds of questions asked, introducing greater complexity into the research process. This has been called a "counter-interview." The honest and frank answering of questions by the researcher and at times relevant disclosure puts them on more of an equal footing, making it more possible for fuller accounts of experience to come forth. Belenky (1996) disclosed the horizontal and affective relationship she courageously built with her participants, making her transformed into a “vulnerable researcher.” Jourard(1968) showed how self-disclosure can elicit disclosure: "dialogue is like mutual unveiling, where each seeks to be experienced and confirmed by the other....Such dialogue is likely to occur when the two people believe each is trustworthy and of good will" (p. 21). Buber (1965) said:

> Where the dialogue is fulfilled in its being, between partners who have turned to one another in truth, who express themselves without reserve and are free of the desire for semblance, there is brought into being a memorable common fruitfulness which is to be found nowhere else. At such times, at each such time, the word arises in a substantial way between men who have been seized in their depths and opened out by the dynamic of an elemental togetherness. The interhuman opens out what would otherwise remain unopened. (p. 86)

If the respondent depends on the relationship with you for any reason is he/she free to share things that may displease you, disconfirm your hunches or theories?

Mies (1983) suggested interviewing in a group. The process of interviewing can become at the same time an occasion for the development of critical consciousness, thus directly giving back to the participants. Others have argued against incorporating methods aimed at changing the consciousness of one's respondents. Again the issue of negotiating the process with the respondents is crucial in determining if an increase in consciousness is something they desire to have come out of participating in your fieldwork or research.

Interview situations may be positive experiences for interviewees, allowing them to share experiences and points of view. It also has the potential to be misleading, confusing, seductive, and possibly dangerous (Kvale, 1996, 2014; Patai, 1987). At times the intimacy of the interview situation may encourage the interviewee to share things he/she is later uncomfortable with. The privacy of the interview situation is starkly different from the public light of presentation and publication of research. To the extent the interviewee has misconstrued the interview as a friendship situation, he/she may be sharing things for the benefit of the researcher, hoping that friendship will in turn be quickened, which turns the research method into a strategy of exploitation, stripping cultures and communities from their dearest and sacred possessions (Smith, 2012). Allowing the interviewee to read the transcript and to veto things that may have been said is an ethical safeguard against some of the harm that can result from misconstruals, misrepresentations, or colonial appropriation of the knowledge shared in the interview situation.

Tandon(1981) addressed the validity of a particular way of obtaining data, arguing that "*the data collection process that is most relevant to both parties determines its validity.* When the data-collection process is disjointed from the context and the content of the dialogues, it becomes invalid" (p. 299). Nelson & Prilleltensky (2010) centralized the necessary assessment of political validity of research, that is, the discernment if research is attaining values of social and environmental justice, peacebuilding, and ecological sustainability and acting upon them.

X. Analysis of data

Data analysis is often a largely unconscious interplay of the participant's meanings with the values and experiences of the data analyst. Working toward good interpretations involves becoming increasingly aware of how one's pre-understandings are preempting the emergence of new understanding from the data. To accomplish this the recording of reflections and inner dialogue during the analysis phase is often helpful.

A principle method for increasing consciousness in this regard is to work data in a group; to try out one's interpretations and subject them to immediate feedback and criticism. This approach is maximized when the group analyzing the data is comprised of a variety of people, from different contexts. Such a group can work together to clarify what questions of a narrative transcript facilitate 'better' (i.e., more valid) interpretations (Brown, Debold, Tappan, Gilligan, 1991). For instance, Carol Gilligan and her research community gradually expanded the interpretive community to include women of color and of different socio-economic experience when they worked with girls' transcripts, some of whom were Hispanic, African-American, and poor (Brown & Gilligan, 1992).

Have you considered including the participants in the analyzing of the data? This can be done in all stages of data analysis or in the final stage, giving the participant a chance to read and comment on the analysis. What might you gain from this practice? What might you lose? Does this weighing bring up ethical dimensions of the analytic process you are favoring?

Mc Taggart describes validation as "an explicit process of dialogue...[and] can only be achieved if there are appropriate communicative structures in place throughout the research and action" (1997, p. 13). What communicative structures have you carefully put into place?

Sung (1995) suggests we open up the concept of validity to include: 1) **interpersonal validity** which increases with the ability of the researcher to establish conditions of interpersonal openness and trust; 2) **contextual validity**, i.e. "Are we right given our way of framing the research issues?" "Is our way of framing the research questions fruitful and meaningful?"; 3) **catalytic validity**, i.e., does the research lead to new possibilities for social action, for creative transformation?

XI. Discussion and communication of finding

Ordinarily discussion and communication of psychological findings happens within the professional group(s) of the researcher. In a dialogical approach discussion and communication with the participants and the community from which they come is a critical component of the research. When a researcher involves a group of participants in research without attention to how the knowledge derived can be of some use to them, one can characterize such research as cultural invasion, where the ends of the researcher are satisfied without regard to the participants. The researcher needs to ask what the implications of the research are for the group being studied. Obviously, such questions are best answered within the community itself. At times, the dissemination of particular research may serve to harm the community one has studied. A researcher may be faced with laying down their work, in order to keep faith with the people on whom he/she has depended for that work.

Sometimes the form of a researcher's final report is not helpful to the community the research has come from. An alternate form that the community can understand may be called for. Are forums provided for where the study can be discussed, criticized, its implications reflected on? Or have the results been whisked off from the community?

XII. Implementation of findings

To implement findings within a social context, the participants need to be the main catalysts for change. Ideally, the research has felt as though it has arisen from their own context and queries, addresses their areas of concern, and can then lead to changes in their action. Such collaborative involvement maximizes the potential that the research findings will actually lead to positive social change. Educational research has amply shown that when educational researchers ask teachers to implement changes corresponding to their research, little long term change takes place. The researcher--even if bringing ideas congruent to the teachers'--is experienced as an alien force, attempting to override the teachers with expert knowledge. If teachers are involved from the beginning with the research, the potential for long-term change is enhanced.

Daphne Patai (1987), an anthropologist who interviewed many poor Brazilian women, argues that we should not deceive ourselves that we have satisfied our moral obligations by "furnishing opportunities for otherwise silenced people" to share their voice, when "our obligations must extend beyond the immediate situation to the structure that allows that situation to be perpetually reproduced" (p. 21). Brown and Gilligan (1992) argue similarly that the narratives they heard from poor Hispanic and African-American adolescent girls in their research required an engaged participation in the addressing of the social problems these girls personally suffered from, namely, pregnancy from statutory rape and educational settings lacking in care. In what ways might what you learned through your research implicate you morally to further engagement with a community or the issues it suffers?

XIII. Conflicts of interest

Additional ethical issues arise when funding is obtained for one's study from outside of the community one is working with. In such cases the researcher must attempt to clarify to whom he/she is loyal, and to be clear about this with all parties concerned. For instance, after painful experience, most anthropologists refuse governmental contracts with a secrecy clause. Such a clause would require that the funder receive a report of the research, but not the community being studied (Rynkiewich & Spradley, 1976). Carefully think through how contractual and informal obligations with your funding source may lead to betrayal of those being studied.

When publication of research becomes financially profitable, who should profit? In what ways might the community from which the research came profit? The ethics of this issue become more pressing if one has "studied down" in one's research, so that the economic need of the research participants is marked in contrast to the researcher (Patai, 1987). Even if publication does not incur profit, it is likely that the researcher will incur indirect benefits from the research (career-building, status) (Patai, 1987). What steps can be taken to insure that all the parties to the research incur benefit commensurable to their efforts?

Chrisman (in Rynkiewich & Spradley, 1987) describes how he became embroiled in a conflict of interest between the secret society he had joined for the purpose of a study and the possible publication of his findings that included material the society did not want to have be public knowledge. Such a conflict might well have been anticipated at the outset. With full disclosure of the researcher's intentions, respondents may chose not to share information they do not want circulated. While this may compromise the extent of knowledge gathered, it does not involve deception and betrayal.

* * *

These queries and concerns are intended to be suggestive, rather than exhaustive. The intent has been to engage you in a process of reflecting on the ethical issues embedded in your fieldwork and research. Our hope is that this document can be organic and dynamic, in time reflecting the ethical concerns you and your fellow students may unearth in your own work.

References

American Anthropological Association. (1998*). Code of ethics of the American Anthropological Association.* Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association. Available on the AAA website.

American Psychological Association. (1992*). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Available on APA website.

Asad, T. (1973). _*Anthropology and the colonial encounter*. New York, NY: Humanities Press.

Bar On, B. A. (1993). Marginality and epistemic privilege. In L. Alcoff & E. Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Belenky, M., Bond, L., & Weinstock, J. (1997). *A tradition that has no name: Nurturing the development of people, families, and communities*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brown, L., Debold, E., Tappan, M., & Gilligan, C. (1991). Reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voice: A relational method. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Theory, research, and application*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, L., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meetings at the crossroad.* New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Buber, M. (1965). *The knowledge of man.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Ciofalo, N. (2015). Indigenous Psychologies: A Contestation for Epistemic Justice. Unpublished paper.

Collins, P. H. (1991). Learning from the outsider within. In M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Daniels, A. (1983). Self-deception and self-discovery in fieldwork. *Qualitative Sociology, 6*(3), 195-213.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.

Gadamer, H. (1976). *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1956). Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies. *American Journal of Sociology, 6*1, 420-424.

Gluck, S., & Patai, D. (Eds.). (1991*). Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Jourard, S. (1968). *Disclosing man to himself*. New York, NY: van Nostrand.

Kim, U., Yang, K-S., & Hwang, K.K. (2006). *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context.* New York, NY: Springer Science, Business Media LLC.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee Sohng, S. S. (1995). Participatory research and community organizing. Paper presented at The New Social Movement and Community Organizing Conference, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, Nov. 1-3.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1967). *The scope of anthropology*. London, UK: Johnathan Cape Ltd.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1990). Toward a categorical imperative for qualitative research. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Maracek, J., Fine, M., & Kidder, L. (1997). Working between worlds: Qualitative methods and social psychology. *Journal of Social Issues, 53(*4), 631-644.

Mc Taggart, R. (Ed.) (1997*). Participatory action research: International contexts and consequences.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology of feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mullett, S. (1988). Shifting perspectives: A new approach to ethics. In L. Code, S. Mullett, & C. Overall (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives: Philosophical essays on methods and morals*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Nader, L. (1967). Professional standards and what we study. In M. Rynkiewich, & J. P. Spadley (Eds.), *Ethics and anthropology: Dilemmas in fieldwork*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Patai, D. (1987). Ethical problems of personal narratives, or, Who should eat the last piece of cake? *International Journal of Oral History, 8*(1), 5-27.

Patai, D. (1991). U.S. academics and third world women: Is ethical research possible? In S. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pe-Pua, R. (2006). From decolonizing psychology to the development of a cross-indigenous perspective in methodology: The Philippine experience. In U. Kim, K. S. Yang, & K. K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 109-137). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.

Rynkiewich, M., & Spradley, J. (1976). *Ethics and anthropology: Dilemmas in fieldwork.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Tandon, R. (1981). Dialogue as inquiry and intervention. In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), *Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Tandon, R. (1988). Social transformation and participatory research. *Convergence, 21*(2/3), 5-14.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods.* Black Point, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.