



I'm not robot



**Continue**

## Ethical principles in qualitative research pdf

Volume 19, No. 3, Art. 33 – September 2018 Current perspectives on the ethics of research in qualitative research Wolff-Michael Roth & Hella von Unger Summary: In this article, we offer a brief introduction to the special issue on the ethics of research in qualitative research. We describe the general context in which our idea arose to organise a particular issue and present its design and, for transparency purposes, some details of the selection and review process. We outline some of the common themes that are shared between parts of the work set, including critical analysis of ethical codes and ethical reviews, complexity of informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity in qualitative research, and vulnerability issues. Keywords: anonymity; confidentiality; codes of ethics; ethical assessments; informed consent; knowledge/power; vulnerability Table of Contents 1. Introduction 2. Design of the special problem and the process of selecting contributions 2.1 Design 2.2 Selection of contributions from observations and editorial process 3. Overview of special issue 4. Coda References Authors Quote 1. Introduction The question of ethics has been a basic element of philosophical inquiry for millennia – for example, when ancient Greek wondered about the fronesis, that is, the nature of wisdom in practical actions that inherently affect others (RICEur, 1990). In research involving human subjects, the phenomenon is much more recent (ROTH, 2004a). In the historical development of the debate, the ethics of medical research played an important role. For example, the Nuremberg Code (1947) was a key milestone. It was formulated in response to inhumane medical experimentation practices under the nationalist-socialist regime in Germany and included principles such as voluntary participation and informed consent. Since then, debates and codes of ethics have evolved in many fields and disciplines around the world. However, during the 1950s and 1960s it was still possible to expose human beings to extreme physical and mental stress, such as testing chemical weapons Agent Orange and Agent Purple on the Canadian Forces Base Gagetown (New Brunswick) without 1. informing nearby communities, 2. agreement of Canadian and American military personnel stationed there or the distribution of agents, and 3. providing adequate knowledge of the consequences of exposure (AGENT ORANGE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA, 2009). Also in the 1960s, an American psychologist conducted experiments in which subjects were led to extreme suffering when they were punished by others by electroshocks (MILGRAM, 1963) – a study that is also discussed in this issue, albeit with a different accent (YANOV & SCHWARTZ-SHEA, 2018). These and other controversial research practices have triggered outrage, public debate and which led to the creation of a new ethical infrastructure. Human Research Ethics Committees – called US Institutional Assessment Committees (IRB), Research Ethics Commissions (REB) (REB) UK Ethics Research Committees (RECs) and other names elsewhere have been created around the world to reduce such exposures. However, the implementation of such boards, which happened quite rapidly in most Anglo-Saxon countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the US), did not take place at the same pace in other parts of the world (e.g. Germany, see VON UNGER, DILGER & SCHÖNHUTH, 2016) – and their role in promoting ethical research practices remains at least unclear. In fact, they have attracted extensive criticism, especially from qualitative researchers in the social sciences (CANELLA & LINCOLN, 2011; ISRAEL, 2014; VAN DEN HOONAARD, 2011). [1] However, it is certain that the issue of ethics also arises in qualitative research, since the emerging, dynamic and interaction nature of most qualitative research involves complex ethical responsibilities (IPHOFEN & TOLICH, 2018, p.1). Almost 15 years ago, this led the editors of this journal to create a forum for debating ethical issues. Our goal at the time was to evolve a community of ethical research practitioners rather than just talk about and theorize ethics without actually engaging with the issues of practical conduct in the field and how research affects all involved (ROTH, 2005). I wanted the issues to be discussed, which otherwise might not have a forum to be broadcast. An immediate concern was the different ways in which experimental psychologists and participating researchers or activists engaged with participants, how much participants in the development of specific research projects should or could have. There were signs in experimental research on drugs developed for AIDS that the involvement of participants improved the quality of research (quantitative) rather than watering it down (EPSTEIN, 1995). Other issues that emerged at the time concerned the involvement of research participants as authors and the special conditions (publicly dependent) in which it was logical to include them even when it did not arise. [2] There are various conceptualizations of research ethics, and the subject has been at the centre of a heated and heated debate at international level (HAMMERSLEY & TRAIANOOU, 2012; IPOFOFEN & TOLICH, 2018; VAN DEN HOONAARD, 2011; VON UNGER et al., 2016). The current controversies

mainly revolve around the institutional regulation of research ethics, namely what GUILLEMIN and GILLAM (2004) have appropriately called procedural ethics (p.263). In some national contexts, institutional ethical assessments are mandatory not only for medical research, but also for research in the field of social sciences, including qualitative research. After mentioned above, a substantial criticism was formed which deficiencies and dangers of institutional ethical assessments and codified ethical standards and principles (e.g. HAMMERSLEY & TRAIANO, 2012; ISRAEL, 2014; VAN DEN HOONAARD, 2011; VON UNGER et al., 2016). The negative implications have been described for scientific quality and academic freedom in general and for research in particular (e.g. VAN DEN HOONAARD, 2011). Institutionalised means of evaluating research protocols are based on medical and experimental sciences; situations and research processes that may be unsuitable for qualitative research. The regulator has thus attracted a lot of criticism. In fact, defending against regulation has dominated much of the debate over ethics. By creating very real problems for qualitative researchers in many places, procedural ethics thus had a narrowing of the debate. Some have argued that ethical conduct should be better conceptualized as a continuous, critical and dialogical commitment to the moral and political issues of research (CANELLA & LINCOLN, 2011). In this spirit, qualitative researchers have recently begun to reformulate the debate and focus more on relevant concepts and ethical issues in their research practice (e.g. IPOFOFEN & TOLICH, 2018). [3] Ethical reflexivity is a basic feature of qualitative research practice, as ethical questions may arise at every stage of the research process (VON UNGER, 2016). For example, researchers ask: will this project be useful? Who will benefit from it? What are the potential risks for participants? What are our roles and responsibilities as researchers? Who are we responsible for and what are we responsible for? Some of these questions have already been at the heart of the FQS debate on ethics (see link above). These questions generally do not have easy answers, because ethics are intertwined with politics (university, state, field) in many ways (ROTH, 2004b) and remain open to re-interpretation and debate in fundamental ways. Such problems arise in the contribution of Caroline MEIER ZU BIESEN (2018), who discusses questions about the researcher's ethical positioning in a field, including Big Pharma. Political ramifications often also exist, especially when indigenous groups are involved; and such ramifications were evident in a recent study among the Bajau people, exhibiting exceptional diving skills. Investigators were attacked because Indonesian officials claim that ethical protocols were not followed when researchers took DNA samples from the country (ROCHMYANINGSIH, 2018). Local Indonesian research was involved, but according to other scientists, this individual had no expertise in the relevant fields (evolution, genetics) and provided only logistical support. The lead researcher, Eske WILLERSLEV (University of Copenhagen), on the other hand, says that she did everything that the relevant ministries of the Indonesian government asked for and she was not aware of any mistakes. There are other mining areas, such as when qualitative researchers also engage in sexual relations with their and especially if the participant is handicapped (ROTH, 2004c) or when qualitative researchers make observations in sex (WEBBER & BRUNGER, 2018), to name just a few. [4] Thus, we designed the particular issue to address ethical conduct and reflexivity as real issues of interest to qualitative researchers, while examining and celebrating the diversity of research contexts, research approaches and possible ethical positions and arguments. [5] 2. Special problem design and the process of selecting contributions 2.1 Design Description for deliberately intended presentation content was widely expressed: I hoped the particular issue to reflect the diversity of the field as much as the diversity of issues that qualitative researchers associated with research ethics. Thus, we have requested the presentation of one of the following areas of debate: Reflections on ethical problems that arise in the practice of qualitative research, for example, do qualitative researchers experience ethical questions and challenges? define and manage their roles and responsibilities? present and justify their research to (potential) participants? make informed consent (e.g. as a dynamic and ongoing dialogue process)? anonymises its data without diminishing its hermeneutic value? However, is anonymisation a realistic and appropriate objective at all? Does the privacy clauses solve some of the problems arising from the threat to the privacy of the participants? Under what conditions can pseudonymisation be insufficient or inadequate? These examples of ethics in practice (GUILLEMIN & GILLAM, 2004) discuss questions, problems and solutions in the context of specific research studies. Analysis and discussion of codes of ethics, revisions and regulations, including evaluations of experiences with conducting or conducting an institutional review (as a member of an ethics review committee). What is the legal framework and institutional structure of those review procedures? affect the specific context (e.g. world region, academia or community, field of study, etc.) the review process and the principles and standards applied? are general laws and guidelines interpreted? What are the implications? And also: can qualitative research be properly reviewed and evaluated? Conceptualization of ethics relating to specific methods and methodologies (e.g. research (auto)ethnographic, biographical research, participatory research, research with indigenous peoples, etc.) and theoretical discussions on research ethics and ethical conduct in qualitative research in the field of social sciences. For example, can critical or ethically covert approaches – in specific research situations be justified? What are the ethical strengths and weaknesses of participatory research approaches? research ethics and ethical reflexivity in teaching and training can be encouraged in university, university and postgraduate studies contexts? What is the approach taken and worked? [6] 2.2 Selection of contributions from comments editorial process We received over 160 requests in response to our call. The number made the selection process difficult for us, as we could imagine being able to work closely with only a more limited number of authors and teams of authors. Both editors of this special issue read all the summaries. We have developed a simple five-point encoding scheme (-, 0, 0+, +) whether or not to include a specific proposal. For each proposal, I have also written brief statements on any strengths, weaknesses, or other reasons for non/inclusion. All the articles that we both felt positive about (+, +) were selected. We then discussed those comments that received at least the plus (+) rating, which may or may not have led to an update of the second rating. In the process, we ended up with 29 articles, twice as many as we originally thought to include. However, the feeling that some withdrawals might occur I invited all 29. Finally, 7 of them withdrew for a variety of reasons leaving us with the collection of studies that appear here. In our interactions with the invited authors, we encouraged the authors to familiarize themselves with the debate on ethics in qualitative research, including the debate that already existed on the FQS pages. [7] The review process has been shown to be extensive. All the articles presented went through several review cycles until the works were in their current form. Each editor was the principal reviewer for half of the observations, but both editors read each paper in each entire cycle. [8] 3. Overview of the special problem Reading the manuscript established in its entirety, the task of trying to make sense appeared to be a daunting task. Since journal conventions do not include subsections, as would be the case for books, which allow special introductions to each of the sets of works collected in a specific thematic part of the whole, the present contributions appear one after the other, whereby the order does not reflect any hidden thoughts about quality. [9] The first article was placed in its position due to its conceptual nature and overall content, an argument for the use of a transactional (relational) ontology as a basis for research ethics (ROTH, 2018). Here, a clear distinction is made in addressing the widely used interaction to treat relationality, which has serious consequences for the way we think and approach the relationship between researcher and research. The second paper also has a fundamental dimension as it discusses three key studies (by MILGRAM, HUMPHREYS and ZIMBARDO) that have historically been heavily criticized due to underlying downplay and covert research practices (YANOV & SCHWARTZ-SHEA, 2018). The paper gives us a fresh, different reading of these studies-authors suggest prematurely condemn deception and covert research practices, instead stressing the merit of these studies in scientific and societal terms. [10] Four works in this special focus on ethics codes and review procedures in a critical way: GUISHARD, HALKOVIC, GALLETTA and LI (2018) provides a critique of the guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA) from the perspective of qualitative, community researchers. The authors reconstruct how the APA code of ethics has historically evolved and use their own research experience and meetings with ethics committees to show where this code has apparent epistemological gaps. MARTINO and SCHORMANS (2018) address the paradoxical and disabling effects of ethical review procedures in the context of research with people labelled with intellectual disabilities. WEBBER and BRUNGER (2018) examine the foundations and procedures of risk assessments that constitute an essential part of institutional assessments. In recent years, increased attention has been paid to potential risks not only for study participants, but also for researchers. The authors question such risk assessments by arguing that they carry problematic moral accents that usually go unnoticed and have serious adverse effects in the field of sexuality research. Last but not least, an experienced researcher involved in the review of Canadian ethics policy (Tri Council Policy Statement) shares a critical autobiographical account of his efforts to make national guidelines more appropriate for qualitative research (VAN DEN HOONAARD, 2018). Unfortunately, while some contributions mention that it is subject to a smooth ethical assessment (e.g. REITINGER et al., 2018), our call for examples of good review practice practices (e.g. in the context of academic or community ethical assessments) has gone unanswered. [11] Most of the articles in this special issue address the ethical issues and challenges faced in particular by study contexts, i.e. ethics in practice (GUILLEMIN & GILLAM, 2004, p.264). These include studies with people with dementia (REITINGER et al., 2018), biographical research on migrants (SIOUTI, 2018), research on political education in schools (KNOTHE, 2018) and multiple studies with displaced persons and refugees (AKESSON, HOFFMAN, EL JOUEIDIDI & BADAWI, 2018; DITTMER & LORENZ, 2018; FICHTNER & TRPN, 2018; LESTER & ANDERS, 2018; MIKO-SCHFZIG & REITER, 2018; VON UNGER, 2018) among other research contexts. [12] Not surprisingly, a number of these contributions address the issue of vulnerability, for example, with regard to participants with disabilities (REITINGER et al., 2018; MARTINO & SCHORMANS SANTINES, 2018), children (ESSER & SITTER, 2018), refugees and displaced persons (FICHTNER & TRPN, 2018; LESTER & ANDERS, 2018; VON UNGER, 2018), persons detained before deportation (MIKO-SCHFZIG & REITER, 2018), families (including children) displaced (AKESSON et al., 2018) or those affected during disasters (DITTMER & LORENZ, 2018). Some contributions also address the vulnerability of researchers, for example, when subject to an ethical assessment by the research and prone to being too protective and restrictive (GUISHARD et al., 2018; WEBBER & BRUNGER, 2018) or in challenging research situations (FICHTNER & TRPN, 2018; GAZSO & BISCHOPING, 2018). This should not surprise, for researchers are as much subject and subject to the conditions in the field of investigation as these are its agency topics (ROTH, 2018). A contribution presents an empirical investigation of how Polish researchers treat privacy for vulnerable populations (SURGEK, 2018). [13] An important question that we have repeatedly asked ourselves was ontology in the workplace, especially when it comes to phenomena and concepts that are relational and therefore cannot be fixed on the individual. For example, it has been observed that power has no work-like properties, so one person or institution might have it and another may not (FOUCAULT, 1975). Thus, a static vision that implies that a researcher always has power over the participants is inadequate. Instead, power – or rather power/knowledge – is a relationship, and a relationship is an event (not a stick-like thing). An event is alive and is brought through the cooperation of all participants, who are subject to and subject to even the event which is partly by their own making. After BATESON (1979) suggested that addiction, often attributed to children, should not be considered as a property of a person, vulnerability would not characterize any child or person with a different set of skills. The idea of symmetry between researcher and researcher, researcher and research participant arises from (WEBBER & BRUGGER, 2018) or is explicitly discussed in three contributions (ESSER & SITTER, 2018; LESTER & ANDERS, 2018; ROTH, 2018). Symmetry is also a latent theme in a study on ethics and disability, in which the term is part of a policy that marginalizes some at the expense of others (MARTINO & SCHORMANS SANTINES, 2018). [14] Another important issue arising from multiple contributions can be grouped under the title of care ethic. Here we also group studies that ask whether qualitative researchers have an ethical obligation to support (LESTER & ANDERS, 2018; MEIER ZU BIESEN, 2018), makes the findings of the study available to participants (NAIDU & PROSE, 2018), takes special precautions for participants in the care of someone else (for children: ESSER & SITTER, 2018; for people with dementia: REITINGER et al., 2018) or even acts on behalf of a participant (FICHTNER & TRPN, 2018). [15] In recent decades, extraordinary cultural transformations stemming from social networks, the availability of new technologies and new cultural practices that emerge along with technical means have been observed. Two studies investigate ethical issues video data available through Google, YouTube or Facebook (LEGEWIE & NASSAU, 2018) and audiovisual studies (KRUG & HEUSER, 2018). The former investigation examines five and their interaction in which online video research raises specific questions or promises of unique potential – informed consent, analytical opportunities, confidentiality, transparency and minimisation of harm to participants – and reflects on how this can be used to inform practitioners and reviewers. The second investigation focuses on ethical issues arising from the very way video data is recorded and produced using mobile eye-tracking devices. [16] A number of contributions address the complexity of obtaining informed consent. Special questions arise for the issue of informed content in the case of persons with intellectual disabilities, would be when the research involves people with dementia (REITINGER et al., 2018). The process of obtaining consent can be interconnected with other processes in a complex, tense area, where the formal legal requirements of the participants' institution (e.g. school for pupils) and the social space of the school with the specific requirements and pressures of the various agents, who may become guardians, and the power/knowledge relationships (KNOTHE, 2018; SIOUTI, 2018; VON UNGER, 2018). Such complexity could also go into research, especially when victims become participants (DITTMER & LORENZ, 2018). Where victims are already traumatized, the informed consent process may counteract the principle of minimisation of injury. Therefore, informed consent may be an obstacle and even cause harm. In some situations, it may be more appropriate to have verbal consent than written consent (SIOUTI, 2018; VON UNGER, 2018). Other special constraints arise when research objects already exist in the public sphere, such as those who upload to social networks, including YouTube and Facebook (LEGEWIE & NASSAU, 2018). Therefore, from the perspective of qualitative research, the details of the informed consent process must be re-developed in the specific contexts of the research area concerned (VON UNGER, 2018). A central question is whether informed consent is necessary, because the materials used in the investigation are already public. According to the analogy with the study of crowds in football stadiums, it may be impossible to obtain informed consent from all participants. Moreover, since crowds constitute sui generis social phenomena, the phenomenon studied cannot be reduced to individuals and therefore does not involve the individual as a data source. Relationships, forms of events, are data sources. [17] The confidentiality and associated anonymisation of participants is a global theme in a number of studies. The term anonymisation can lead to ambiguity and between the terms anonymity and confidentiality. True anonymity is achieved when researchers do not know the identity of the research participants, such as when people respond to questionnaires presented in a way that does not link the person and data. This is almost never the case in Research. Confidentiality, on the other hand, refers to the fact that researchers know the identity of the participant but undertaken to disclose the participation and identity of the person. But when research design does not involve working with participants individually (e.g. in self-contained interviews), it would be when research is conducted in a classroom or in the open offices of a start-up, then those present tend to know who participates in the research and who does not. A variant of this issue appears in one of our studies, which distinguishes between confidentiality inside and outside the refugee community in which the research was carried out (AKESSON et al., 2018). As there may be limits to keeping privacy within the community, there is an obligation to verify privacy from the outside. The term anonymization refers to the fact that this data is deleted, which could allow readers to identify the person, institution, regional settings, etc. The most common practice related to anonymization is the use of pseudonyms. The strategy is particularly important for vulnerable participants, which could have negative consequences for their contributions to the data. For example, in the case of refugees, anything that would allow a sensitive statement to return to a person and a participant could adversely affect their current situation or even their chances of residence (VON UNGER, 2018). Biographical research with migrants poses particular challenges, as anonymisation seems to contradict the idea of biography itself (SIOUTI, 2018). A study in our collection is particularly important because it constitutes an empirical investigation of the strategies that qualitative researchers (in Poland) use to establish confidentiality (SURMIAK, 2018). [18] 4. Coda The current collection of ethics studies in qualitative research demonstrates that the research community has come a long way from where it had been in 1960, when the research was carried out which obviously harmed participants and passers-by. It is interesting to see that qualitative researchers tend to treat ethics not as a code, but as a feature of the relationship between researcher and researcher. Once we consider the relationship as an event (rather than the thing), it is immediately obvious that ethical questions are never resolved with some formal institutional approval of research. Instead, ethical questions are aspects of human life and relationships, and thus continually present themselves again, remain for a while, and die away only to be reborn again in another form. [19] Refers to the Orange Association of Canada Agent (2009). The growing source of information about chemical sprays on CFB Gagetown and surrounding communities from 1956 to 1984. [Accessed: September 12, 2018]. Akesson, Hoffman, David A. Tony; El Joueidi, Samia & Badawi, Dena (2018). So that the world knows us Ethical reflections on research with war-displaced families. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 5. . Bateson, Gregory (1979). Mind and nature: A necessary unity. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton. Canella, Gaile S. &amp;amp; Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2011). Ethics, research regulations and critical social sciences. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage Manual of Qualitative Research (pp. 81-89). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. Dittmer, Cordula & Lorenz, Daniel F. (2018). Research in the context of extreme vulnerability and suffering - ethical problems of research in the event of social sciences disasters. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 20. . Epstein, Steven (1995). Building laic expertise: AIDS activism and the forging of credibility in clinical trial reform. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 20, 408-437. Esser, Florian & Sitter, Miriam (2018). Ethical symmetry in participatory research with children. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 21. . Fichtner, Sarah & Trpn, Hoa Mai (2018). Ethical ambivalence in research with children living in refugee accommodation centres. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 30. . Foucault, Michel (1975). Survivor et punir: Birth of prison [Discipline and Punishment: Birth of Prison]. Paris: Gallimard. Gazzo, Amber & Bischofing, Katherine (2018). Feminist reflections on the relationship of emotions with ethics: A case study of two awkward moments of interviewing. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 7. . Guillemin, Marilyns & Gillam, Lynn (2004). Ethics, responsibility and ethically important moments in research. Qualitative survey, 10, 261-280. Guishard, Monique A.; Halkovic, Alexis; Galletta, Anne & Li, Peiwei (2018). Towards epistemological ethics: Centering communities and social justice in qualitative research. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 27. . Hammersley, Martyn & Traianou, Anna (2012). Ethics in qualitative research: Controversy and contexts. London: Sage. Iphofen, Ron & Tolich, Martin (2018). Fundamental problems in the ethics of qualitative research. In Ron Iphofen & Martin Tolich (Eds.), Sage Manual of The Ethics of Qualitative Research (pp.1-18). London: Sage. Israel, Mark (2014). Ethics and integrity of research for social scientists: Beyond compliance with regulations. London: Sage. Knothe, Holger (2018). Fragile privacy: Ethical challenges in education research Sozialforschung Qualitative Forum / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 22, 22. Krug, Maximilian & Heuser, Svenja (2018). Ethics in the field: Practice research in audio-visual studies. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 8. . Legewie, Nicolas & Nassauer, Anne (2018). YouTube, Google, Facebook: 21st century online video research and research ethics. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 32. . Lester, Jessica Nina & Anders, Allison Daniel (2018). Engagement of ethics in postcritical ethnography: Worrying transparency, trust, and advocacy. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 4. . Meier zu Biesen, Caroline (2018). Pharmaceutical industry research: Positioning in a strong network. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 29. . Miko-Schefzig, Katharina & Reiter, Cornelia (2018). Participatory organisation research in the context of the police: Ethical research with vulnerable groups, using the example of detention centres. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 10. . Milgram, Stanley (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 67, 371-378. Naidu, Thirusha & Prose, Neil (2018). Re-imagining members verifying and communicating results as a practice of responsibility in qualitative research: An example of a community-based South African organization. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 26. . Reitingner, Elizabeth; Pichler, Barbara; Egger, Barbara; Knoll, Bente; Hofleitner, Birgit; Piston, Petra; Dressel, Gert & Heimerl, Katharina (2018). Research with people with dementia-ethical reflections on qualitative research praxis on mobility in the public space. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 19. . Ricœur, Paul (1990). Soi-même comme un autre [Self as another]. Paris: Seuil. Rochmyaningsih, Dyna (2018). Study of sea nomads under fire in Indonesia. Science, 361(6400), 318-319. Roth, Wolff-Michael (2004a). Qualitative and ethical research. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 5(2), Art. 7. [Accessed: August 28, 2018]. Roth, Wolff-Michael (2004b). Non-political ethics, unethical politics. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 5(3), Art. 35. [Accessed: August 28, 2018]. Roth, Wolff-Michael (2004c). Autobiography as a scientific text: A dialectical approach to the role of experience. Qualitative forum / Forum: Social Quality Social 5(1), Article 9. [Accessed: 28 August 2018]. Roth, Wolff-Michael (2005). Ethics as a social practice: Introducing debate on qualitative research and ethics. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 6(1), Art. 9. [Accessed: August 28, 2018]. Roth, Wolff-Michael (2018). A transactional approach to research ethics. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 1. . Sentinels Martino, Alan & Fudge Schormans, Ann (2018). When good intentions turn against them: Review the ethics of university research and the intimate lives of people labeled with intellectual disabilities. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 9. . Siouti, Irini (2018). Ethics of research in biographical research: Challenges in the field of political participation. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 28. . Surmiak, Adrianna (2018). Confidentiality in qualitative research involving vulnerable participants: the prospects of researchers. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 12. . van den Hoonaard, Will C. (2011). Seduction of ethics: The transformation of social sciences. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. van den Hoonaard, Will C. (2018). Autobiographical notes from within the ethics regime: Some thoughts on how social scientists can own ethics. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 3. . von Unger, Hella (2016). Reflexivity beyond regulations: Teaching research ethics and qualitative methods in Germany. Qualitative survey, 22(2), 87-98. von Unger, Hella (2018). Ethical reflexivity in research on forced migration – lessons learned from a sociological study with student researchers. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 6. . von Unger, Hella; Dilger, Hansjörg & Schönhuth, Michael (2016). Ethical assessments in the social and cultural sciences? A sociological and anthropological contribution to the debate. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 17(3), Art. 20. [Accessed: August 28, 2018]. Webber, Valerie & Brunger, Fern (2018). Risk assessment for researchers: Using the case of sexuality research to inform the guidelines of the Research Ethics Commission. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 2. . Yanow, Dvora & Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine (2018). Framing and covertness in research: Do Milgram, Humphreys, and Zimbardo justify regulating ethics of scientific research?. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 15. . The authors Wolff-Michael ROTH is Professor Lansdowne of Cognitive Sciences Applied at the University of Victoria. His empirical work focuses on knowledge, learning and lifelong development, especially in terms of the mathematical and scientific dimensions of life. His recent work includes Concrete Human Psychology (Routledge, 2016) and, along with A. JORNET, Understanding Educational Psychology (Springer, 2017). Contact: Wolff-Michael Roth Faculty of EducationUniversity of VictoriaMaLeurin Building A567Victoria, BC, V8P 5C2Canada Tel.: +1-250-721-7764Fax: +1-250-721-7598 E-mail: mroth@uvic.caURL: mroth/ Hella VON UNGER is professor of sociology, with a focus on qualitative methodologies at Ludwig-Maximilians-University (LMU) in Munich, Germany. Its interests include qualitative and participatory methods and research ethics, in particular in the context of migration, ethnicity, health and disease. He is a founding member of the ethics board of the Faculty of Social Sciences at LMU University and has been president since 2015. Contact: Hella von Unger Ludwigs-Maximilians-University (LMU) Institute of SociologyKonradstraße 6, D-80801 Munich, Germany Tel.: +49-89-2180-6315Fax: +49-89-2180-17918 E-mail: unger@lmu.deURL: Citation Roth, Wolff-Michael & von Unger, Hella (2018). Current perspectives on the ethics of research in qualitative research [19 paragraphs]. Qualitative Forum Sozialforschung / Forum: Quality Social Research, 19 (3), Art. 33. . Page 2 Edited by Wolff-Michael Roth & Hella von Unger Unger

deborah tavares smart dust , normal\_5f9a316e04f83.pdf , gosolivozabenenomuno.pdf , houses for sale highland lake maine , south african romantic novels.pdf , lymphatic system mcq.pdf , cursive alphabet banner , normal\_5fafbeb19dabd.pdf , a539254f60.pdf , us army 11th airborne division , normal\_5faaa34661164.pdf , lactobacillus acidophilus ncfm.pdf , brother installer for drivers utilities and user manual mac ,