

RESEARCH ETHICS CONFERENCE 2021

Abstract Booklet

Research Ethics Association

Contents

Session 1A (S1A) 6

Navigating TNE ethics and devolvement procedures in a pandemic setting 6

Ethics for each and for all: Negotiating ethics in multi-national projects 7

Session 1B (S1B) 8

Tertiary students' views of vulnerability as research participants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 8

Learning about ethics from music and dementia 9

Session 1C (S1C) 10

Ethical Decision-Making in Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) in New Zealand 10

University Ethics Review and Approval and the contexts created by Covid-19: One Faculty's experiences of 'work in progress' 11

"Rotten Orange Problems" in the Physical Sciences and a Developing Course in Ethics for Nuclear MSc Students 12

Session 1D (S1D) 13

When teachers research teachers: A methodology for post-classical analysis of narrative texts through an ethical lens. 13

Mitigating power differentials when conducting insider research and your participants are also your students 14

Education case study: The psycho-emotional experiences of mainstream secondary school students with dyslexia from student and teacher perspectives 15

Session 1E (S1E) 16

Global Research Ethics: A Toolkit for Practice 16

Workshop 1A (W1A) 17

Risk and Responsibility: ethical considerations within engaged research 17

Workshop 1B (W1B) 18

Drop-in Ethical Applications Advice 18

Session 2A (S2A) 19

Live Podcast Recording: History of Ethics in Biology and Evolution 19

Session 2B (S2B) 20

The Ethics of Engagement in Creative Practice (and the impact made on individuals, culture and environment.) 20

Session 2C (S2C) 21

Exploring ethics education and support for culturally and linguistically diverse research in Australia 21

Applying ethical frameworks across cultures: examples from Nigeria and Kenya 22

Understanding ethical issues in researching Islam in educational leadership 23

Session 2D (S2D) 24

Queer Theology: An Ethical Trilemma 24

The role of common morality for principlism in biomedical ethics. 25

Ethics and Documentary Research 26

Session 2E (S2E) 27

Ethical dilemma in virtual research during COVID 19 27

Ethics of Interspecific Research During the Covid-19 Pandemic 28

Brave Zoom World: the ethics of conducting engaged, interdisciplinary research at a distance. . . 29

Workshop 2A (W2A) 30

Ethical considerations of qualitative secondary analysis (Part 1). 30

Workshop 2B (W2B) 32

Building your moral compass with LEGO Serious Play (Play 1) 32

Workshop 2C (W2C) 33

The awareness of UK students in an intercultural communication context: identities, cultures, values, communication and friendship formation 33

Session 3A (S3A) 34

Towards an innovative model for shifting power in international development research ethics: the ECID case study 34

Ethical issues in using participant-constructed visual timelines 35

The Unethical Image: Critiquing Photographic Research Methodologies in the Context of 21st-Century Sex Work. 36

Session 3B (S3B) 37

Exploring a participant-culture led approach to ethical research in Kenya 37

Towards ethical South-North education research partnerships 38

Session 3C (S3C) 39

Sex trafficking, ethics and empowerment: Reflections on data collection (during COVID-19 pandemic) with survivors of sex trafficking 39

Creating ethics support systems for social research on gender-based violence 40

Where does the buck stop? Being a Responsible Researcher with vulnerable populations and sensitive topics When Running Qualitative Psychological Research. 41

Session 3D (S3D) 42

Language decisions as ethical dilemmas at all stages of research 42

Moral imagination as a way of resolving ethical dilemmas in qualitative social research 43

Is embedded research (more) ethical? 44

Session 3E (S3E) 45

Reflexivity and Sensitivity: Researching the Perceptions of UK students on Identities and Cultural Diversity 45

Is Ethics Pertinent to Politics? 46

Workshop 3A (W3A) 47

Ethical considerations of qualitative secondary analysis (Part 2). 47

Workshop 3C (W3C) 49

Mental Capacity and Consent – ethical considerations when a person lacks capacity to consent. . . . 49

Session 4A (S4A) 50

Covert Research and Networked Harassment: A Holistic Review 50

Situational ethics in pandemics: Issues with using online messaging Apps in the context of sensitive topics in Colombia 51

Negotiating mobile phone-based gendered mobility analyses using feminist research ethics and practice 52

Session 4C (S4C) 53

Employees and big data: a virtue ethical approach 53

Remote recruitment of people with dementia and carers: ethical dilemmas of an RCT study 54

Ethical approval for use of un-consented human tissues: a clinical research experience. 55

Session 4D (S4D) 56

A decolonial art-led research within an ecology of care: from Ethics to Risk Assessment 56

Exploring Colombian marginalised youth voices within páramo social-ecological systems to understand the impacts of environmental risks on youth resilience 57

The Visible Traces of Bias: The Disruption of CanLit's Status Quo 58

Session 4E (S4E) 59

GSE Ethics Special Interest Group Roundtable 59

Workshop 4A (W4A) 60

Problematizing the Ethics Process: An Anthrozoological Perspective 60

Notes on the source material 61

Source pages 62

Session 1A (S1A)

Beyond Borders: Ethics in transnational and global research

Paper 1: Navigating TNE ethics and devolvement procedures in a pandemic setting

Speaker(s): Fernando Pabst Silva

Keywords: devolvement, ethical approval process, transnational education, franchise partners

Abstract: One aspect of the working-from-home paradigm of the lockdown period where it relates to research ethics has already generated some attention and interest: how to ensure that systems that are in place are fit for purpose and robust enough to continue providing the due diligence expected from these systems. However, one aspect that has not been looked at more directly is the case of research ethics associated with transnational education, and how to navigate the sometimes incongruent scenarios between different nations when maintaining franchise partnerships in this area and all the associated risks and rewards of the devolvement of ethics consideration. I will present a case study of how that has happened in the context of Cardiff Metropolitan University, which has established TNE links with Singapore, Sri Lanka, Greece, and others.

Session 1A (S1A)

Paper 2: Ethics for each and for all: Negotiating ethics in multi-national projects

Speaker(s): Fiona Harrison, Alison Fox, John Oates

Keywords: ethics protocols; multi-partner projects; ethical regulations; ethics-in-practice

Abstract: Projects involving multiple partners carrying out co-ordinated research in different national contexts have a task to undertake to co-ordinate their protocols, including their approaches to ethical integrity. This is especially the case where the project includes vulnerable groups such as children and young people (C&YP) as participants, requiring the research team to take high responsibility both collectively and locally for ensuring their rights will be respected. If Article 12 of the UNCRC is to be fully evoked in thinking about the voice of the child (Lundy, 2007) then this involves both protection, limiting exposing C&YP to risks, and enablement, including their perspectives in various aspects of the project. Maximising participation might be considered a 'given' in any research project but, when it includes multiple partners working in different national contexts, how these considerations are taken forward is not straightforward. For them to be realised, ecological views of ethics are helpful (Flinders, 1992; Boutin-Foster et al, 2013; Luks and Siebenhüner, 2007) in identifying the social web of interdependent relationships involved.

This presentation is based on large-scale projects involving many partner organisations in many nations. In these projects, we needed to work with one another in different assemblages. First, in ways which clarified roles for different partners. Second, lead researchers in each partner needed to work with their local research teams. Third, these research teams needed to work with local gatekeepers and practitioners. Fourth, the practitioners needed to incorporate the project's vision into their praxis in ways which could be overseen by the project team. The approach taken to developing an ethical framework for the project centred on showing respect aimed at building trust across the national settings, rather than imposing a project lead-directed framework. This presentation reflects on creating coherent project approaches to research ethics and data protection which support both protection and enablement of its participants set amidst a diversity of regulations. This is set within Stark's notions of anticipatory versus constitutive approaches to ethical documentation and deliberations (Stark, 2011). This allowed flexibility to develop different variants of protocols across settings whilst ensuring compliance with different national expectations.

The presentation includes reflections on tensions which arose and were resolved as such approaches were carried forward through the projects. These challenges and setting-specific issues are reflected upon in terms of an ongoing approach to ethics-in-practice, rather than relying on universal ethical procedures set in stone at the start of the project.

Session 1B (S1B)

(Re)conceptualising Vulnerability Beyond Deficit Definitions

Paper 1: Tertiary students' views of vulnerability as research participants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Speaker(s): Amanda B Lees, Simon Walters, Rosemary Godbold

Keywords: Ethics review, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, student participant, vulnerability

Abstract: Ethics review bodies have their genesis with medical research, where they continue to play a key role in protecting vulnerable participants. With an expansion of the scope of ethics review to now assess research representing broad-ranging disciplines, methodologies and paradigms, there are calls for increased critical analysis. An under-researched area is the role of ethics review for research within the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, where significant variation in ethics review exists internationally (Lees et al., 2020). Not all institutions require formal review for teaching and learning research and requirements differ when ethics review is stipulated. Variation supports the notion that what counts as ethical conduct in teaching and learning research is subjective, including terms such as vulnerability. Participant views on ethical conduct in research are seldom canvassed, with factors such as vulnerability determined by members of ethics review bodies. There are indications that students taking part in teaching and learning research may not necessarily see themselves as vulnerable (Sarpel et al., 2013). This presentation addresses both the call for further research on participant views and increasing critical analysis of ethics review, by providing insights on participant vulnerability from tertiary students enrolled in a health faculty at a New Zealand university

Session 1B (S1B)

Paper 2: Learning about ethics from music and dementia

Speaker(s): Ursula Crickmay

Keywords: Music, dementia, ethics, posthumanism

Abstract:

In this presentation I will describe how taking a posthuman approach to my PhD research has raised questions for me about the formal ethical processes involved in research, particularly as I have encountered them whilst attempting to work with people living with dementia. In my study I am exploring a posthuman understanding of 'co-becoming' in creative music workshop practices. Following Braidotti (2018), the human subjects (including myself) who are co-becoming with my research are acknowledged as 'embodied and embedded' (p. 1). Body and mind are not seen as separate; objects, spaces and environments are seen not as contexts for bodies, but as emergent, enmeshed co-participants. Sound emerges, co-becoming collectively with and within the workshop assemblage which has so far included (but not been limited to) instruments, toys, voices, bodies, Zoom, microphones, carpets, playgrounds, arts organisations, songs, smells, iPads, recordings. The ethical questions that have arisen for me particularly concern agency and contribution. From a posthuman perspective, agency is no longer restricted to human minds, but rather distributed across human and non-human materialities (Coleman and Osgood, 2019). This is vividly demonstrated in a music workshop. Whilst musicking together, the agency of people living with dementia is enacted in relation, emergent in creative intra-actions involving bodies, sounds, and many other materialities. By contrast, the ability for people living with dementia to give consent to take part in research is understood as an individualised, cognitive matter concerning bounded individuals. By this measure, many people with dementia are deemed unable to give consent to take part in research: their agency is not acknowledged. Further to this, once someone else is needed to give consent, the Mental Health Act 2005 must be consulted (HRA, 2021). This adds the requirement for the research to address the 'impairing condition' of those deemed unable to give consent themselves. I argue that this reduces a person with dementia to a set of impairments. It resonates with Tom Kitwood's (1997) seminal work on dementia and personhood in which he points to how people living with dementia may be considered less than human, defined not by their uniqueness, but by their pathologies and incapacities. I will argue that the formal ethical processes I have encountered in my research diminish the agency of people living with dementia, and that there are ethical consequences for the processes of knowledge production from which they may be unintentionally excluded.

Session 1C (S1C)

University ethics review processes

Paper 1: Ethical Decision-Making in Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) in New Zealand

Speaker(s): Thushini Jayawardena-Willis

Keywords: Ethical Decision-Making, Human Research Ethics Committees, Diversity, New Zealand

Abstract:

Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) in New Zealand are generally accredited by the Health Research Council (HRC). These Committees are responsible for assessing the ethicality of human research projects that involve human participants, their data or tissue. Such projects derive from a wide range of disciplines, such as social sciences, management, law, psychology and 'low risk' health research projects that are exempt from the Health and Disability Ethics Committee (HDEC) review (Gibson et al., 2020). New Zealand's Education Act (1989) requires academic staff and students to exercise their right to 'academic freedom and autonomy' according to the 'highest ethical standards' (see e.g. Sections 161 (2) (a) and 161 (3) (a)). However, it fails to define what constitutes 'highest ethical standards'. An indication of what these might be are stipulated in the ethics guidelines for health research, such as the National Ethics Advisory Committee (NEAC) guidelines (2019), HRC Guidelines (2012), Te Ara Tika Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics and Health Research Guidelines for Pacific Research (2014). Nevertheless, there is no single legislation, policy or guideline that directs researchers as to which ethical standards/principles they should adhere to when conducting human research. Moore and Donnelly (2018) highlight two significant aspects of IEC decision-making in New Zealand: code consistency review and ethics consistency review.

While HRC Guidelines highlight the significance of having a diverse membership in terms of technical/subject matter expertise, little emphasis is made to encourage IECs to recruit members of diverse backgrounds, such as ethnicity, religion, gender, sexuality, or people with disabilities. See for example, Section 4.2 c) (v) of the Guidelines, which states that the Committee membership should be half male and half female, which explicitly ignores gender diversity in New Zealand. Likewise, the HRC Guidelines seem to undermine the importance of having members of different cultural backgrounds, ethnicities, or religions, as "other cultural considerations" is recognised as a low priority when it comes to IEC membership appointments (See e.g., Section 4.2 c) (vi)). Furthermore, the HRC Guidelines recommend individual members "to abstain from some or all of the decision-making process because of strong personal, moral or religious reasons" (p. 8) by ignoring the fact that an individual's ethnicity, religion, spirituality and gender diversity have an impact on their moral reasoning and ethical decision-making (see e.g. Jayawardena-Willis et al., 2019, Fernando & Jackson, 2006). Hence, the aim of this research is to explore and understand how IECs make ethical decisions through the lived experience of former IEC members and thereby contribute and extend Moore and Donnelly's (2018) research.

Session 1C (S1C)

Paper 2: University Ethics Review and Approval and the contexts created by Covid-19: One Faculty's experiences of 'work in progress'

Speaker(s): Lucy Davies, Tatiana Dias Souteiro, Calum Gordon, Phil Jones

Keywords: university research, ethics, Covid-19

The paper is an analysis of the responses developed to date within a university research ethics system, that of UCL's Institute of Education', to the ethics review and approval processes in relation to the contexts created by Covid-19. The University creates separation in roles between 'academic' and 'professional services' staff, and these relate to how the responses to Covid-19 were designed, managed and reviewed in terms of ethical approval. The presentation is jointly made by staff who were involved in the process from both academic and professional service perspectives.

The paper will consist of a narrative of the responses over time, along with a critical analysis of the process. The narrative will include: (a) the organisational responses over time and the dynamics between different 'participants' within this; (b) the products of these organisational responses; (c the impact and review of the responses.

The analysis will address:

The ways in which change in both ethical review and approval was understood and constructed - in particular, how the researcher and research participant featured within this;

the nature and effects of the complex organisational dynamics within the University system, between, for example, the central organisational processes operating across the University as a whole and Faculty and Department or Research Centre;

how different contexts and situations of research were engaged with in relation to ethics review and approval.

We will ask what has been learned so far, and what are the implications of this learning for the time ahead? Within (i)-(iii) Issues will be explored that particularly featured within our experiences - such as the dynamics between the responses to Covid-19 and debates about areas such as research ethics approval and 'risk', 'non-maleficence', 'vulnerability' and 'justice'. We will explore the relationships between the specific responses developed and critical concerns about the nature of university ethics committees and their work as being 'technologies of accountability and control … to elicit conformity and render academics more responsive to management'(Kohn and Shore, 2017: 243), drawing on Lederman's concepts of 'regulatory hypervigilance' (2006) and Schrag's (2010) 'ethical imperialism'. The paper aims to share experiences of our particular response in terms of University research ethics review and approval and the contexts created by Covid-19 and the knowledge and insight gained, so far, from this time. "

Session 1C (S1C)

Paper 3: “Rotten Orange Problems” in the Physical Sciences and a Developing Course in Ethics for Nuclear MSc Students

Speaker(s): G. R. Mackenzie

Keywords: Physics, engineering, nuclear

I am a PhD student in Physics at the University of Bristol, working on diamond-based photovoltaics to generate small amounts of electricity from gamma rays, for such applications as improving the safety of existing radioactive waste stores. I have some basic formal ethical training, and deliver an extra-curricular lecture series, Introduction to Ethics for Nuclear Scientists and Engineers, to the Nuclear MSc students at the UoB South West Nuclear Hub.

The goal of this course is to give students the tools to recognise ethical decisions when they need to be made, and make them within the timeframes that working life demands. This talk will start on the ethical landscape facing early-career researchers in the physical sciences and engineering. It will explore a particularly demonstrative personal experience, focussing on the concept of epistemic limits and “Rotten Orange Problems” – an analogy for routine tasks which will, occasionally, conceal thorny ethical questions. It will from there move to a description of the UoB course.

The ethics of nuclear weapons have been developed in bursts since the invention of the technology [1], drawing perspectives from a broad range of ethical traditions [2], and producing bona-fide ethical construct such as Nye’s Five Maxims. By contrast, work on the ethics of nuclear energy has been more sporadic; in 2015, on the question of whether there exists “an ethics of nuclear energy”, Sven Ove Hansson has said “the answer is, unfortunately: it depends” [3]. There is a sense in which attempts to influence ethics within the discipline of nuclear energy have only recently ramped up. Be that as it may, the civil and military aspects of the industry are inextricably linked, despite the fact that support for nuclear weapons development is by no means total, or even typical, among nuclear energy researchers. This tendency for interlinked development will be illustrated via another personal experience. The impact of this state of affairs on building the course will be discussed. Finally, the intended future development of the course will be explained, and I will appeal for perspectives from the audience which might strengthen it.

Session 1D (S1D)

Ethics in Education

Paper 1: When teachers research teachers: A methodology for post-classical analysis of narrative texts through an ethical lens.

Speaker(s): Daniel Carvalho*

Keywords: Teacher-practitioner, Identity tensions, Ethical implications, Teacher retention

As teaching has evolved into a post-graduate profession, we encounter an ever-increasing body of teacher-practitioner research generated knowledge in education. Due to the close contextual proximity of the researcher and the subject, the findings from teacher-practitioner research offer unique insight into the field of education. However, the close proximity also gives rise to a number of ethical dilemmata as a result of possible identity tensions between researcher and participant which could influence the conclusions derived by the researcher. In this communication, I present a methodology I used while performing post-classical narratology analysis on interview data obtained from teachers that have recently left the profession. The method was specifically designed with the purpose of minimising the influence of identity tensions and pays close attention to the ethical implications of the dilemma on the results obtained. Here, I discuss how conflicting positions between the interviewer and interviewee can be resolved while evaluating the influence of researcher positionality on the contextualisation of data. By accounting for the identity tensions as well as giving due consideration to the ethical implication of the analysis, amongst themes that were already reported in the literature, the study revealed how the implementation of a teaching and learning policy supported by research can negatively impact teacher retention. This, relatively uncommon theme, highlights the unintentional consequences research can have in an educational setting and the significance of this will be discussed in more detail.

Session 1D (S1D)

Paper 2: Mitigating power differentials when conducting insider research and your participants are also your students

Speaker(s): Isabel Hallam

Keywords: power-differentials, insider research, students, research quality, persistence

When research is undertaken at the researcher's place of work, their 'insider' perspective will likely influence the research question, methodology and interpretation of results (Costley, Elliott & Gibbs, 2010, p. 6). When that research takes place at a university, and the participants are students of the researcher, the researcher's positionality is even more influential and volatile. The in-build differentials of power between the student-participants and lecturer-researchers risk the research quality and the validity of the findings. Barstow (2008, p. 53) describes power differential as 'an enhanced amount of role power that accompanies any position of authority' and considers that once in a position of power peoples' tendency to empathise. It could be argued that the in-build student-lecturer power relationship is distorted during insider and student-lecturer research. Student-participants are needed by the lecturer-researcher and with their views being sought and listened to, student-participants might feel the power tilting in their favour. However, if the student-participants perceive the lecturer-researcher to have power over their academic studies, they may seek to please the lecturer-researcher. Thus, insider research of this nature needs to consider and mitigate any potential power differentials to maximise research quality. T

he current research explores the psychology of students' persistence during the Covid-19 campus closures. Online group interviews were undertaken throughout the campus closures of 2020 with 12 students who met every month to discuss their motivation, self-efficacy, sense of belonging and perception of the curriculum, all factors that influence student persistence (Tinto, 2017). Insider research mitigations were put in place to maximise research quality: being conscious of the social norms and organisational values of the academic community, appreciative of the time given by student-participants, complying with anonymity and confidentiality and highlighting student-participants' right to withdraw and the importance of honest answers (BERA, 2018; Costley, Elliott & Gibbs, 2010, pp. 31-32). The lecturer-researcher has reflected on the online group interviews and observed a tendency for participants to give socially desirable answers. It is possible that student-participants were not as honest and truthful in their responses due a shift in power-differentials which induced response bias and a desire to give what they perceived to be the 'correct' or socially desirable answers. This presentation will explore the impact of mitigations to reduce power differentials during this insider research, and propose additional mitigations that could have enhanced research quality.

Session 1D (S1D)

Paper 3: Education case study: The psycho-emotional experiences of mainstream secondary school students with dyslexia from student and teacher perspectives

Speaker(s): Kerissa Nelson

Keywords: inclusion, education, dyslexia, students, teachers

The goal of this research is to create knowledge and promote understanding of the psycho-emotional experiences of students with dyslexia (SWD) in mainstream classrooms and to offer an opportunity to teachers to consider SWD's perspectives in informing their teaching practices. I have chosen this topic because as an educator, mentor and international student from Jamaica I want to enhance the psycho-emotional experiences of SWD by expanding the knowledge of educators, including strategies available to them for use in a dyslexia-friendly classroom. Fostering dyslexia-friendly classrooms means increasing access, inclusion and opportunity in schools for SWD which is aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 of providing quality education for all. To achieve the aims, I will address three questions: What do SWD say about their psycho-emotional experiences in mainstream classrooms in South West England? What do SWD who are now attending university say about their past psycho-emotional experiences in mainstream classrooms in South West England? How might these findings support teachers to develop their practice?

My role in this research is to understand the psycho-emotional experiences of mainstream secondary school SWD from student and teacher perspectives, and how their knowledge of dyslexia is socially constructed from an interpretivist and social constructivist perspective. This research draws on multiple perspectives as well as a multi-temporal case study. Participants will be selected using purposeful sampling then data analysed using concurrent data analysis. The boundaries of this case study are formed around three main cases comprising three groups of individual cases. This research will generate several potential classroom strategies to improve the psycho-emotional experience and academic attainment of future SWD that could be trialled in post-doctoral research and influence policy relating to mainstream classrooms and enhance the psycho-emotional experiences of secondary school SWD by expanding the knowledge of educators including strategies available to them. Ethical considerations include informed consent, information sheet, focus group guide, openness and honesty, right to withdraw, protection from harm, debriefing, confidentiality and anonymity, and a data management strategy.

Session 1E (S1E)

Global Research Ethics: A Toolkit for Practice

Speaker(s): Joseph BURKE, Research Fellow, School of Health in Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh. Dr. Clara CALIA, School Deputy Director of Research Ethics & Integrity; Lecturer in Clinical Psychology, University of Edinburgh. Dr. Cristóbal GUERRA, Clinical Psychologist, Master in Psychology and Doctor in Psychotherapy; Associate Professor of the School of Psychology of the Universidad Santo Tomás, Chile. Dr. Tobi OSHODI, Lecturer in the Department of Political Science, Lagos State University (LASU).

Keywords: Global Research Ethics; Research Journey; Reflective Analysis

Global research projects are built on a shared commitment to finding solutions to intractable, large scale and complex challenges. Ethics is a fundamental feature of contemporary global research, yet how ethics is conceptualised and enacted can vary from culture to culture, institution to institution, and discipline to discipline. Furthermore, global research can include interactions between people with significant differences in power and voice. It may also involve working with individuals who are highly vulnerable due to their socioeconomic status, ethnic or gender identity, physical and mental wellbeing, or an inadequate legal and political protective environment. Global researchers must therefore be critically aware of their own practices and perspectives, as well as those of the individuals they collaborate or engage with. If global researchers are to be successful in identifying and promoting solutions to the significant challenges the world currently faces, then they must be able to develop processes that allow stakeholders to communicate around and reflect on the ethical dilemmas that arise. This consideration led to the development of an Ethics Toolkit for global research.

The Ethics Toolkit has been developed in collaboration with more than 200 global researchers from more than 30 countries and 60 different disciplines. Rather than offering ethical regulation, it offers a flexible frame of reference which promotes contextual ethical reflection and accountability within the research process and among research teams. The global research toolkit proposes two fundamental axes of reflective analysis; firstly, iterative ethical analysis throughout the ‘Research Journey’, and secondly, ethical analysis based on the ‘4Ps’ model: Place, People, Principle and Precedent. We will present how the Toolkit could be a resource for researchers working on global projects.

English website: https://www.ethical-global-research.ed.ac.uk/

Spanish website: https://www.ethical-global-research.ed.ac.uk/es

Ethical Action in Global Research Core Team: Action AMOS (University of Edinburgh, UK); Lily ANDERSON (University of Edinburgh, UK); Prof. Lisa BODEN (University of Edinburgh, UK); Joseph BURKE (University of Edinburgh, UK); Dr. Clara CALIA (University of Edinburgh, UK); Prof. Liz GRANT (University of Edinburgh, UK); Dr. Cristóbal GUERRA (Universidad Santo Tomás, Chile); Dr. Charles MARLEY (University of Edinburgh, UK); Dr. Mark MCLEISTER (University of Edinburgh, UK); Dr. Tobi OSHODI (Lagos State University, Nigeria); Prof. Corinne REID (Victoria University, Australia); Dr. Sam STADDON (University of Edinburgh, UK); Dr. Edgardo TORO (Pontifical University Catholic of Valparaíso, Chile)

Workshop 1A (W1A)

Risk and Responsibility: ethical considerations within engaged research

Hosted by: Veronica Heney, Charlotte Jones and Lorraine Hansford

Keywords: Engaged research, co-production, payment, risk, relationships, collaboration

Abstract: Engaged research is an approach akin to co-production, participatory research, and public involvement, which seeks to critically address the traditional relationship between the 'researcher' and 'research participants', considering the impact of power on modes of knowledge production, and seeking greater equality and collaboration in planning, conducting, and benefiting from research. Engaged research is often conducted with people who in the past have been marginalised or excluded from public health research, with the explicit aim of addressing these harms and exclusions. Engaged research is thus an approach which seeks to place ethics at the heart of research practice: nevertheless it raises many ethical quandaries and often sits uncomfortably with current modes of 'doing' and 'assessing' Ethics in universities.

This experiential and action-oriented workshop aims to address the ethical issues raised by practices of engaged research, drawing together our own expertise and facilitating opportunities for participants to share knowledge and think collectively. Each of the three facilitators will speak briefly about ethical concerns in their own practices of engaged research. VH works on cultural representations of self-harm as understood by people with experience of self-harm, CJ's reflections will be grounded in her collaboration on reproductive support for people with variations of sex characterstics (VSC/Is). LH will draw on research within low-income communities looking at mental health and experiences of end of life and bereavement.

We will collectively discuss three areas of particular interest: first, issues of payment and other practicalities including anonymity and authorship in which engaged research might diverge from standard practice. Second, the common ethical frameworks of risk and vulnerability and the ways in which engaged research might problematise or disrupt them. Third, the ways in which engaged research practices blur or shift expected roles and relationships, and how to navigate that change in an ethical way.

The workshop will then turn to group work, in which participants will be invited to discuss key issues or questions raised in the introductory presentations. The groups will then be led through activities to encourage the sharing of experience and expertise and collaborative working towards potential solutions or recommendations. This section will facilitate mutual support and solution-building, balancing the desire for nuanced, sensitive discussion with the practical need for tangible actions and helpful approaches, and allowing for dialogue and the emergence of a community of practice around this vital theme.

Workshop 1B (W1B)

Drop-in Ethical Applications Advice

Hosted by: Gail Seymour, Ethics and Governance Manager at the University of Exeter

Abstract: Gail Seymour, Research Ethics and Governance Manager at the University of Exeter, is going to be offering individual advice, support and feedback on your Research Ethics applications. With years of experience, she is the perfect person to look over your application and answer any questions you may have regarding the process, form and anything relating to ethical clearance for your project.

This workshop runs on a preregistration-only basis. You would have been allocated a 15-minute slot at the time of your registration. Please have your ethics form ready if you had elected to upload it in advance. Make sure you take this opportunity for valuable input to better your application and learn from an expert in the field!

Session 2A (S2A)

Live Podcast Recording: History of Ethics in Biology and Evolution

Speaker(s): Rebekah White and Thomas Land

Keywords: life sciences, history, research, biology, animals, discussion

Abstract: Welcome to Darwin's Black Book! In this episode, two scientists talk about the tricky ethical history of biology research - and hopefully have a few (appropriate) laughs along the way. Both hosts are evolutionary biologists, and are postgraduate researchers from the University of Exeter and the University of Southampton, with a keen interest in promoting engaging and interesting scientific topics in science communication. Come along to watch the live recording of this episode, which will later be broadcast on Spotify, Apple Music, and more. A scientific background is not necessary to enjoy the show. Bring your best applause, best energy, and best questions!

Session 2B (S2B)

Paper 1: The Ethics of Engagement in Creative Practice (and the impact made on individuals, culture and environment.)

Speaker(s): Eleanor Neason and Gary Marshall-Stevens

Keywords: Artistic Practice, Ethics, Participation, Social Engagement

Abstract: In today's politically and culturally volatile climate, the role of an artist as researcher is becoming more central. With polarisations of social commentaries, the creative mind is arguably at the forefront of impact and change. Art practice as a source of knowledge production is progressively important in this age of uncertainty; through practice-led methodologies, our research allows us to negate cultural climates, reimagining and reshaping engrained and silent narratives and structures in our society.

With the privilege of being a creator comes a moral obligation to consider how our work will affect our audience. When using artistic practice as research, it is naturally partnered with the intent of pressing boundaries and exploring the line between our ethics and our taboos. We must think about the impacts and implications of the output of our research methods, both socially and environmentally; to not to diminish rights, cause hurt or harm to others (individuals, groups, organisations, environments), and to ensure that our artwork minimises potential harm to subjects and our audience (Carpenter, 2019). When considering an ethical approach to research methodologies, the idea of the 'ethical researcher' is not one that sits comfortably with the creative tradition of questioning boundaries; creative practitioners do not have measures in ethics to provide case studies and examples for their own ethical know-how. A key part of researching through an artistic practice is negating ethical engagement and governing our own ethical know-how through our individual investigations. Currently 'ethics' is viewed as one of the many boundaries that art and artists, should cross (Bolt, 2016).

In this conference, we collectively aim to create a dialect exploring the responsibilities and expectations of ourselves as artists and researchers, through the framework of engagement and ethical duties as creative practitioners. Through an amalgamation of presentations, performances and audience engaged demonstrations, we will question the impact of our practice in our own fields, considering the role of the artist, the authorship of our work, the inclusion/exclusion of artistic engagement and who is invited to the table when discussing pre-existing power relations and traditional roles between researcher, audience and engagement.

Session 2C (S2C)

Decolonising education research: towards pluriversal ethical perspectives

This panel chaired by Alison Fox, Bukola Oyinloye and Natalie Tegama brings educational researchers together seeking approaches to ethical enquiry which place the research context centrally. The panel reflect on the ways researcher positionalities and values inform their approaches to international research, embracing pluriversality to negotiate more equitable ethical approaches. This ethical reflexivity (Gewirtz and Cribb, 2006; 2008) involves each researcher in taking a critical review of influences on them as an individual and on their host institutions situated in the Global North (Dados and Connell, 2012).

Paper 1: Exploring ethics education and support for culturally and linguistically diverse research in Australia

Speaker(s): Rachel Burke, Alison Fox, Sally Baker, Margaret Kettle, Tebeje Molle Mekonnen and Bonita Marie Cabiles

Keywords: Decolonising research, decolonising ethics, educational research, critical reflexivity, ethical frameworks

Abstract: Speakers report on research exploring connections between university commitments to pluriversality and the values and perspectives evident in institutional approaches to research ethics education using a critical discourse analysis of documents from 10 Australian universities.

Session 2C (S2C)

Paper 2: Applying ethical frameworks across cultures: examples from Nigeria and Kenya

Speaker(s): Bukola Oyinloye and Kris Stutchbury

Abstract: Doctoral research by Bukola Oyinloye and Kris Stutchbury demonstrate the applicability of a deliberative ethical framework covering deontological, consequentialist, ecological and relational considerations (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). Kris employed the framework in a study focused on teacher educators in one Kenyan University. Bukola used the framework in research in rural Nigerian communities to develop a contextually-appropriate moral-ethical framework.

Session 2C (S2C)

Paper 3: Understanding ethical issues in researching Islam in educational leadership

Speaker(s): Asima Iqbal

Abstract: Asima reflects on her doctoral research which investigated how (and if) Muslim headteachers in both England and Pakistan perceived the role of Islam in their leadership position. Asima focuses on the challenges she faced in Pakistan and explores alternative interpretations of her experiences.

Session 2D (S2D)

Philosophy beyond the armchair: Morality and ethics across disciplines

Paper 1: Queer Theology: An Ethical Trilemma

Speaker(s): Jack Slater

Keywords: Religion, Theology, Sexuality, Queer

Abstract: Queer theology, as part of the wider project of Christian theology, is a subdiscipline inherently tied to complex ethical questions surrounding sexualities, religious traditions, emancipatory politics and the properly ethical relationship academic research should have to these questions. In recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of this conference, I intend to begin this paper by briefly sketching the scope of queer theology and introducing the central ethical questions with which the field grapples. I then contend that there is a central ethical trilemma that complicates any queer theological project. I conclude by sketching how my own research has approach this trilemma by drawing on decolonial epistemologies.

The central contention of this paper is that there are three fundamental ethical demands that run through any queer theological project. The first is that any queer theological project ought to be in some way affirming, emancipatory or in some other way broadly positive for the lived experiences of LGBT+ people. The second is that queer theology needs to engage with intellectual honesty and fidelity with the reality of the Christian tradition in both historical and contemporary contexts. The third is that queer theology should avoid engaging with problematic and reactionary theologies of sexuality in such a way as to legitimize and propagate them (Tonstad, 2015). These three demands form a trilemma in that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to adequately satisfy all three simultaneously.

This would suggest that ethical research in a queer theological context may be hard to achieve even if the formal conditions for ethical research as set out by official guidelines are satisfied. Rather than suggesting a way in which this trilemma can be navigated, I conclude this paper by suggesting that this trilemma indicates an irresolvable ethical problem for queer theological research. Drawing on decolonial epistemologies (Mignolo, 2011) and with reference to my own research, I argue that a properly ethical approach to queer theological research will require new theoretical and theological frameworks that move beyond those provided by contemporary Christian theology.

Session 2D (S2D)

Paper 2: The role of common morality for principlism in biomedical ethics.

Speaker(s): Andrew Jones

Keywords: Biomedical Ethics; medical practice; principlism; Kant; morality; normativity

Abstract: One field of medical practice that has been strongly influenced by philosophy is biomedical ethics. Principlism has been a dominant position within this field for last 40 years in no small part due to Beauchamp and Childress's Principles of Biomedical Ethics (PBE) currently at its eighth edition. Their account offers a generally pluralistic that combines aspects of utilitarian and deontological ethical perspectives. This paper critically examines the justifications for their deontological principles. They argue that medical ethical principles can be divided into four general categories: respect for autonomy, nonmaleficence, beneficence, and justice. These principles extend far beyond medical ethics as they regarded as prima facie truths that persist at all levels of society; '[b]ecause our principles are universally applicable, we defend a global bioethics and not merely customary, regional, or cultural rules. Our principles correlate with basic human rights and establish what is ethically acceptable for all societies' (Beauchamp and Childress, 2019).

I argue that it is not necessary for PBE to justify these four principles as based on a 'common morality' that is ethically acceptable for all societies. Rhodes argues that there is a discordance between what is morally permissible for medical professionals and for everyday situations. She also argues that the four principles of PBE are too vague to offer concrete guidance for medical professionals (Rhodes, 2019). In response to these criticisms, I argue that this vagueness is indicative of more general problems inherent to Kantian deontological ethics. In order to avoid this vagueness, PBE should argue that, instead of a common morality, the foundations for principlism emerge from the training that medical practitioners must undertake in order to qualify. I argue this would avoid the criticisms directed toward their unnecessary claims regarding common morality, whilst simultaneously maintaining the principles outlined by PBE are necessary as ideals that should guide medical practice.

Session 2D (S2D)

Paper 3: Ethics and Documentary Research

Speaker(s): Jonathan Doney

Keywords: Ethics, Historian, Documentary Analysis, Policy

Abstract: There is a potential for researchers who depend on archival and other documentary sources to overlook ethical issues altogether, on the grounds that they are at a distance from those being researched. This attitude is often intensified by institutional ethics committees and their policies; they often see such work as being outside the normal ethical frameworks. Yet, there is a growing recognition that the researcher engaging in this sort of work does have ethical responsibilities. There is unquestionably an ethical responsibility to protect fragile historical materials in order to conserve them for the use of those who come after us. In addition, there is, as Foucault highlights, a need to avoid the danger of 'projecting modern notions back into cultures where they had no role or "reality"'. There is also an implicit ethical responsibility to 'those whose activities and relations' are described. In recent years the ethical responsibilities associated with historical enquiry have been more openly discussed. Brian Fay raised the question, 'Do historians have an ethical responsibility, and if so, to whom?'.

This paper will discuss some of the key responses to Fay's question in relation to documentary studies more widely, considering particularly the issues of Voluntary Informed Consent and anonymity. It will conclude with a call for ethics policies to de-marginalize documentary and historical research from their purview, and put in place appropriately robust ethical procedures for historical and other document-based research studies.

Session 2E (S2E)

Ethical research constraints in the COVID-19 era

Paper 1: Ethical dilemma in virtual research during COVID 19

Speaker(s): Suparna Bagchi

Keywords: ethical dilemma, virtual research, teacher-researcher dynamics, children's voice

Abstract: COVID 19 has invaded the world for almost a year. Universities, with their extensive technological resources, have moved to a predominantly online platform, which is economical, flexible, and convenient (Davis et al., 2019). In this paper, I would discuss the ethical challenges that the online platform poses to qualitative researchers like me who are undertaking virtual research studies. Research should be guided by strong ethical principles and necessary precaution against emotional harm to all participants. We have seen research undertaken directly with children via Skype (Webber, 2020). However, it is different when a researcher must research virtually based on teacher-conducted classroom activities, which would have been otherwise conducted by the researcher with the children in normal times. The situation becomes difficult when the research involves sensitive topics with minors. While there is sufficient interaction with teachers, the schools have granted limited access to the children, thus placing me in a largely invisible and formal position.

The research requires children's active involvement as equal collaborators in the meaning-making of their lived experiences (Clark and Moss, 2011). Ethically speaking then, can just a few introductory video clips by the researcher be effective and honest enough to strike a familiarisation with the students? The researcher faces another ethical dilemma that whether a virtual presence as a mere spectator can ensure that the minors are sensitively and impartially treated. Student-teacher relationships are based on strong hierarchical power relationships. In such a situation, how do principles of power transform into principles of communication, and how do the principles of communication monitor differently the kinds of awareness concerning their replication and probabilities of change? (Bernstein, 1996:18, cited in Daniels, 2016:102). The teacher possibly has to be careful not to influence and objectify the children so that they can express their feelings fully, no matter how contrary these might be to the research questions (Creswell and Creswell, 2017; Leeson, 2014). This will enable the children's voices to "form a central and equally considered part of any evidence base which concerns them" (Pascal and Bertram, 2009:255). The researcher needs to recognise that a teacher's role is different from a researcher's role, which might bring in variations in the entire research process. Mutual trustworthiness and negotiated ethics become the essential criteria in this teacher-researcher collaborative venture. While there are valuable resources available informing about techniques to research virtually, it is also important to discuss their ethical dimensions.

Session 2E (S2E)

Paper 2: Ethics of Interspecific Research During the Covid-19 Pandemic

Speaker(s): Tiamat Warda

Keywords: Anthrozoology; Covid-19 Pandemic; Research design; Interspecific interlocutors.

Abstract: Students beginning their PhD or MA in 2020 were and are continuing to be faced with the complications of redesigning and conducting their research during the Covid-19 pandemic. For many, this has resulted in unique ethical considerations compared to their original, in-person fieldwork, in particular, perhaps, those researching nonhuman animals.

This paper addresses the question: How can interspecific, qualitative research be altered to ethically bring in the nonhuman animal interlocutors in their own right? It is based on qualitative, anthrozoological research which explored the emotional labour of guide dogs and their instructors, adding the additional complication of studying emotion from a distance.

The discussion is based on autoethnographic data from the researcher's own experiences navigating this pandemic environment. Participant observations can act as an undeniably valuable method within multispecies ethnographies. Therefore, before beginning the data collection process, a virtual alternative (Zoom interviews) to in-person observations of both human and other animal interlocutors was sought to offer meaningful, anthrozoological outcomes.

Findings suggest that the ethics of excluding the voices of nonhuman animals in pandemic and perhaps post-pandemic research, due to travel restrictions, is essential to consider when presenting research findings which represent and can ultimately impact them. However, while there are ethical considerations which can speak against such a data collection practice, it has the potential to benefit nonhuman animal interlocutors. In addition to allowing for longer interviews, as interviewees were at home, multiple interviewees expressed that the questions they were asked had caused them to question their work and guide dog colleagues in a way that they had not in their, at times, twenty-five years practising the career.

This paper suggests that such reflection might have been caused, in part, by the almost one year which the interlocutors spent in isolation, experiencing heightened emotions, while most of the global population was questioning and contemplating most aspects of their life and relations with others. For qualitative social scientists, especially for anthrozoologists, faced with entirely redesigning their approach to data collection, such ethical considerations are essential to address.

Session 2E (S2E)

Paper 3: Brave Zoom World: the ethics of conducting engaged, interdisciplinary research at a distance.

Speaker(s): Virginia Thomas

Keywords: Ethics, Engaged research, Interdisciplinary research, Physically distanced research, Technology, Transparency

Abstract: From ‘Feed the Birds’ to ‘Do Not Feed the Animals’ was designed as an experiment in ‘engaged research’ (Holliman, 2017), in which collaboration across disciplines and with third sector partners would be fostered via regular sociality and shared problem-solving. The project was predicated on in-person contact, sociability and working with objects in archives and museum collections across the country. Like so many things, however, the project has been profoundly disrupted by COVID-19. In this paper, I discuss our experiences of this disruption and the creative redesign of the project in the face of the ongoing uncertainties of the pandemic, the need to safeguard the health of all involved and, most particularly, the ethical considerations and challenges of conducting engaged research at a distance and in the midst of a pandemic.

This involves adapting the project over time according to the changing conditions we find ourselves in, taking into account the ethical considerations of working with the old and new technologies adopted by the project, and efforts to remain open and transparent despite the limitations of our currently isolated and potentially insular situations. In addition to this, given that the project is highly interdisciplinary and brings together researchers from the humanities and the natural and social sciences, we need to understand and adapt to the different approaches to ethics across disciplines and integrate new, enhanced ethical policies into our research. In doing so we seek to become fluent in the ethical concerns of other disciplines, thus enhancing our individual literacy in research ethics and developing a model for ethics in interdisciplinary research.

Workshop 2A (W2A)

Ethical considerations of qualitative secondary analysis (Part 1).

This workshop considers ethical concerns when conducting secondary qualitative data analysis and making qualitative data available to others for re-analysis hosted by Helen Foster-Collins.

During Part 1, there will be an interactive presentation talking about - What is secondary analysis? What is it used for? Where might data come from? and What ethical issues relate to conducting secondary analysis of qualitative data?

Hosted by: Dr Helen Foster-Collins

Keywords: qualitative data, secondary analysis, ethical implications, participant confidentiality, context-dependent data

Abstract: Secondary analysis can be defined as any further analysis of an existing data set ‘which presents interpretations, conclusions or knowledge additional to, or different from, those presented in the first report’ (Hakim, 1982). Secondary analysis can be conducted as a re-examination of one’s own research data, or upon data obtained from various third-party sources, such as sharing of data between collaborative research groups or from data archives. The use of secondary qualitative data has seen increased emphasis in recent years, with increased availability of data through stipulations by funding bodies to share data once research is complete, and active promotion through funding sources targeted at research projects which have secondary analysis as a central feature (e.g. ESRC, 2018). However, the ethical issues faced when re-analysing qualitative data differ to those arising from re-use of quantitative data, and it can helpful for researchers to be aware of these complex issues right from the planning stages.

This workshop considers what ethical concerns we might encounter as researchers, in relation to:

conducting a secondary analysis of qualitative data, and

making our qualitative data available to others for re-analysis as well as thinking too about the ‘ethical positives’ of secondary analysis in qualitative research.

This two-hour workshop will consist of:

a short presentation, outlining some of the dilemmas we may encounter when undertaking secondary analysis or making our data available to others. This will be illustrated with examples from my own PhD research in teacher and medical education.

a hands-on workshop where attendees can think about how they would approach such issues, using worked examples.

time for questions and open discussion regarding attendees’ current or planned research which utilises secondary data.

Topics addressed will include: the potential advantages and drawbacks of secondary analyses of qualitative data, and ethical issues relating to participant consent, confidentiality and anonymisation, and the context dependent nature of qualitative data.

The aims of this workshop are that attendees will better understand the ethical implications of conducting secondary analysis on qualitative data, to aid them in designing and carrying out secondary analysis in their own research, and for planning to share their data with other researchers.

Hakim, C. (1982). Secondary analysis in social research: A guide to data sources and methods with examples. Allen and Unwin/Unwin Hyman.

ESRC 2021. Secondary Data Analysis Initiative. https://esrc.ukri.org/research/our-research/secondary-data-analysis-initiative/

Workshop 2B (W2B)

Building your moral compass with LEGO Serious Play (Play 1)

Hosted by: Caitlin Kight and Karen Kenny

Keywords: creative, discussion, LEGO

Abstract: This one-hour session will use the LEGO Serious Play technique to foster a fun, creative, and insightful discussion about ethics. The activity incorporates three different types of LEGO builds, each of which will help participants delve into and communicate their own understanding of ethics -- what their own ethics are, the impacts of different ethical positions in society, and how ethics vary amongst researchers, disciplines, and industries. Additionally, participants will gain first-hand experience of the LEGO Serious Play methodology, enabling them to harness this process for future brainstorming and ideation work.

Workshop 2C (W2C)

The awareness of UK students in an intercultural communication context: identities, cultures, values, communication and friendship formation

Hosted by: Mona Helmi

Keywords: Awareness of cultures, understanding identities, willing to communicate

Abstract: Cultural awareness is one of the most required knowledge in social science today because it allows individuals to witness the world through different lenses and explore the abundance of various cultures. Sias, Drzewiecka, Meares, Bent, Konomi, Ortega & White (2008) stated that research underpinning intercultural communication should serve in diminishing negative perceptions in individuals minds in order to build better communities.

The main question in this workshop will be: Do students on campus need to be aware of others identities and cultures through books and other sources of information to diminish their negative perceptions about others or do they need to communicate on campus with international students to learn more about who they are and what their identities and cultures are?

The workshop aims to discuss the UK host students who are studying at a university South West the UK and the degree in which they are aware of the importance of identities in a multicultural context. The workshop discussion is meant to unfold a number of factors such as the British host students' degree of awareness of the intercultural communication position between them and international students. The workshop looks forward to reaching practical strategies and suggestions to foster intercultural communication on campus to have a well-rounded academic and social experiences for both host and international students.

Mona A Helmi earned a master's degree from Newcastle University in Applied Linguistics and TESOL in 2015. In 2016, she moved to the University of Exeter to pursue her PhD. As a current doctoral researcher in Graduate School of Education, her research project underpins intercultural communication, focuses on the British Students' understanding of identities and cultures. It also explores the British students' experiences and perspectives towards international students and their friendships formation.

Session 3A (S3A)

Respecting participants' agency

Paper 1: Towards an innovative model for shifting power in international development research ethics: the ECID case study

Speaker(s): Cathy Bollaert and Talatu Aliyu

Keywords: International development, research ethics, shifting power

Abstract: This paper engages critically with the challenges concerning ethical practice in international development research and practice and how different institutional and local ethical priorities can be managed. This is explored using the Evidence and Collaboration for Inclusive Development (ECID) programme as a case study. ECID is a four-y

ear programme, funded by the UK Government through UK Aid Connect, delivered through a consortium of nine partners led by Christian Aid, and implemented by in-country partner organisations in Myanmar, Nigeria and Zimbabwe.

Doing research ethically in international development goes beyond standards within academic research; it requires engaging with additional areas of expertise including risk management, safeguarding and protection, responsible data management, gender equality and social inclusion and conflict sensitivity among others. Recognising each of these spheres of expertise remain quite siloed, the paper begins by introducing an integrated ethical framework for doing development research. Following on from this, the paper explores some of the challenges that western ethical norms pose in societies with different systems of meaning-making and ethical norms. This is illustrated using ethical dilemmas raised within the Christian Aid Nigerian country programme. The paper concludes by offering an innovative model for shifting power in research that was piloted within the programme. This requires thinking about how ethics in development research and practice can be reviewed in organisations which typically do not have their own Ethics Review Boards and in ways which does not reproduce western hegemony in relation to whose knowledge and ethics counts in research practice.

Session 3A (S3A)

Paper 2: Ethical issues in using participant-constructed visual timelines

Speaker(s): Alison Pearson

Keywords: Visual timelines, power imbalances, ethical obligations

Abstract: My presentation will share ethical benefits and challenges I have experienced in using participant-constructed visual timelines to support semi-structured interviews. As a doctoral researcher I have been very aware of the need to act ethically, not just to satisfy the needs of my educational research association(1) and my institution(2), but for my own sense of moral obligation as a researcher. After all, my whole reason for embarking on this research project was to try and make a difference, so it would not sit comfortably if in doing so I made anything worse for those participants who agreed to be involved in my project. I also believe that as participants have given up their time and energy to take part in my research I should not just focus on not doing harm to them, but that the ethical balance should mean that they actually benefit from taking part: that the process is beneficial to both researcher and participants.

My project investigates factors which have both challenged and sustained long-serving teachers, so I have needed to be particularly mindful that sensitive issues might arise during our conversations: in a long career there may be times which participants faced significant challenges which are hard to talk about, or which cause difficult feelings to re-surface. Asking them about their experiences may also promote reflection for participants about their careers: it was important to me that in asking what has helped these teachers to stay that our interviews do not make them feel less happy in their role, or act as the catalyst for them to leave.

My presentation will focus on the use of participant-constructed visual timelines in my research, which I introduced as a way of seeking to address some of the potential ethical issues. Participant-constructed timelines enable participants to control more of the interview direction(3), addressing potential power imbalances, and support pre-interview reflection(4), which can help participants to feel more confident. They have also been reported as having a beneficial therapeutic effect for some participants in previous studies.(5). I will share further ethical dilemmas which have arisen, including:

how to analyse and include these valuable drawings without creating discomfort or compromising participant anonymity

tensions between my sense of ethical obligation to my participants in telling the detail of their stories and the ethical obligations to those reading my research of creating an accessible document that has sufficient clarity.

Session 3A (S3A)

Paper 3: The Unethical Image: Critiquing Photographic Research Methodologies in the Context of 21st-Century Sex Work.

Speaker(s): Camille Melissa Waring

Keywords: sex workers, photographs, arts-based, photo-voice, stigma, ethics

Abstract: This presentation interrogates and questions the practice of creating photographs as part of art-based research methodological approaches to the study of contemporary sex work arguing that the creation of photographs solely for research purposes is an obsolete practice that renders sex worker authored visual data invisible to academic critique denying sex workers the opportunity to challenge the dominate visual discourse of the politics of pity embedded in photographs created by outsiders rendering sex workers without agency over their photographic representation in academic spaces.

Participatory research methods such as photo-elicitation, photo-voice, and photo-novella can no longer be considered ethical approaches to conducting qualitative multi-disciplinary research within the context of contemporary sex work. Photographs created for research purposes are in direct opposition to the rapidly advancing platforms provided by technology that birthed the 21st-century phenomena of the sex worker as image-maker. This is a technological determinism that allows sex workers, for the first time in history, to create and circulate photographs and be in control of their visual narratives. Historical photographic participatory research methods enabled and allowed for a more in-depth insight into the lived experiences of sex workers through the photograph. Research created photographs established rapport with highly stigmatised and marginalised sex workers and engaged sex workers with academia.

However, research methodologies that require contemporary sex workers to create photographs, be photographed or discuss photographs for research purposes are no longer ethical. This absence of scholarly attention to the sex worker as image-maker is due to the reliance on 20th-century photographic participatory research methodologies that are inadequate for studying 21st-century sex work communities and detrimental to sex workers.

Session 3B (S3B)

Decolonising education research: towards pluriversal ethical perspectives

This panel chaired by Alison Fox, Bukola Oyinloye and Natalie Tegama brings educational researchers together seeking approaches to ethical enquiry which place the research context centrally. The panel reflect on the ways researcher positionalities and values inform their approaches to international research, embracing pluriversality to negotiate more equitable ethical approaches. This ethical reflexivity (Gewirtz and Cribb, 2006; 2008) involves each researcher in taking a critical review of influences on them as an individual and on their host institutions situated in the Global North (Dados and Connell, 2012).

Keywords: Decolonising research, decolonising ethics, educational research, critical reflexivity, ethical frameworks

Paper 4: Exploring a participant-culture led approach to ethical research in Kenya

Speaker(s): Natalie Tegama

Abstract: Presented by Natalie Tegama, an early-career African researcher based in the global North conducting research in Africa on health education. Natalie explores the ethics of the contexts she will encounter in her planned doctoral research, seeking to respect the multiplicity of tribes and moral codes of those who reside there (Mundia and Martinez, 2020).

Session 3B (S3B)

Paper 5: Towards ethical South-North education research partnerships

Speaker(s): Rafael Mitchell and a partner representative from the Transforming Education for Sustainable Futures network.

Abstract: Rafael outlines the network's principles and strategies to engender meaningful and equitable relationships and considers the prospects of decolonising research through 'strong internationalisation' (Appadurai 1999, p.237).

Session 3C (S3C)

'Ethically Charged' Research: Researcher responsibility when conducting sensitive research

Paper 1: Sex trafficking, ethics and empowerment: Reflections on data collection (during COVID-19 pandemic) with survivors of sex trafficking

Speaker(s): Ileana-Maria Turda

Keywords: sex trafficking research, ethics, gatekeepers, empowerment, oppression,

Abstract: Research on sex trafficking is confronted with various ethical considerations and dilemmas when victims and survivors are involved as participants. Sex trafficking raises questions of justice and human rights violations and the multifaceted-long-term effects of the exploitation. In addressing trafficking and informing effective policies, scholars recommend micro-scale in-depth empirical research as it addresses cases and their particularities (Cockbain & Kleemans, 2019; Weitzer, 2014). Although there is considerable research in this area, victim and survivor participation is limited (Broad & Turnbull, 2019; Richardson et al., 2016). Nevertheless, survivors are experts concerning their experiences and can provide authentic and accurate accounts, highlighting the complexity of their experiences. Access to victims and survivors is a significant challenge in research (Cwikel & Hoban, 2005; Vearey et al., 2017), which brings further concerns. T

he need to include vulnerable and marginalised communities in research aims to avoid further marginalisation and exclusion, reduce the risk of limited understanding of their contexts, and further construct the social world without their input (Melrose, 2011 in Pearce et al., 2013). Hence, their participation is crucial and highly valuable. Additionally, scholars recognise the therapeutical and healing potential of sharing ones' story if handled with care and attention (Pascual-Leone, Kim & Morrison, 2017). While these arguments are strong, women's participation poses ethical questions as their previous experiences are often traumatic, and therefore the possibility of harm remains. This paper is inspired by an ongoing doctoral study in the UK and Romania, which explores Romanian women's post-trafficking trajectories. It provides a critical overview of challenges encountered in research planning and online data collection, the roles of gatekeeps, and 'the question of ethics' as being used both as a tool for empowerment or further oppression.

At the core of the research, agency, strengths and resilience of survivors aim to create space for empowerment and highlight their resources. While access to participants represented an obstacle, it also created an opportunity for reflection on ethics and the balance between empowerment and further oppression. In this equation, gatekeepers' role is highly acknowledged (Brunovskis & Surtees, 2010), and it navigates between good practices in working with trafficked women or reinforcing predominant narratives of victimhood (Cojocaru, 2015; 2016; Kempadoo, 2015). Additionally, gatekeepers find themselves in difficult positions due to research saturation and the quality and impact sought. Hence, creating dialogue, building trust, ensuring high-quality research represent a few elements that need a mutual agreement in this process. "

Session 3C (S3C)

Paper 2: Creating ethics support systems for social research on gender-based violence

Speaker(s): Katarzyna Struzińska

Keywords: social research ethics; ethics helpdesk

Abstract: Social research with human participants is always connected with ethical concerns and potential risks which should be mitigated. These aspects become more challenging when the research topic is ethically charged and a studied sample comprises vulnerable groups. A good example of such sensitive and ethically complex research is the study of gender-based violence (GBV). Development of knowledge on GBV in the specific context of research performing organisations is a focus of the international project 'Gender-based violence and institutional responses: Building a knowledge base and operational tools to make universities and research organisations safe' (UniSAFE) funded by EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020. UniSAFE research design combines desk-based research on legal and policy framework (in 30 countries), a quantitative survey on prevalence and consequences of GBV (to be implemented in 45 research organisations in 15 countries) and qualitative research (case studies and interviews) on organisational responses to GBV. Regarding the importance of ethics in such comprehensive research, the UniSAFE consortium decided to make it a topic of its own. Consequently, a separate work package dedicated to ethics and research integrity was established.

The presentation will discuss selected measures introduced by this work package to address different ethical aspects of the multilevel research on GBV and ensure that the project's implementation follows critical ethical principles of non-malfeasance, beneficence, respect for individuals and justice. Particular attention will be given to creating the project's Ethics Helpdesk – an advisory body available for both research team members and research participants – that, together with Ethics Guidance Package, provides the ethical framework of the UniSAFE studies. To illustrate the variety of factors to consider while establishing a sound ethics support for a social research project, such issues as an adapted model of the Ethics Helpdesk, its roles and tasks, principles guiding its functioning and communication about its existence will be presented in detail.

Session 3C (S3C)

Paper 3: Where does the buck stop? Being a Responsible Researcher with vulnerable populations and sensitive topics When Running Qualitative Psychological Research.

Speaker(s): Lindsay Lenton-Maughan

Keywords: Dynamic Ethics, Student Research, Qualitative Enquiry

Abstract: I have 10 years' experience as a youth support worker, working with adolescents aged 12-19, before embarking on my studies as a mature Psychology student. I am now in my final year of PhD studies that investigate adolescent anti-social behaviour. During my experience of running qualitative studies, I have noted several issues that, at worst, could cause harm to vulnerable participants and at best cause ethical dilemmas for unskilled student researchers and further their supervisors. Academia can be toxically data driven and competitive, particularly in the sciences, psychology included. In part due to this, ethical considerations may sometimes be overlooked.

Purpose: This talk aims to discuss the issues that could arise when inexperienced researchers run research on sensitive topics and with vulnerable populations. I will address some key factors which could lead to harm for vulnerable participants.

These include, the power dynamic in the room and during recruitment, dealing with disclosure which can be a very real issue for unskilled student psychology researchers who may be unaware of the procedure to follow or whether they can break confidence, and managing endings. Just like in a therapeutic relationship, the ending of a qualitative study/interview/focus group can be experienced as a therapeutic process and should be managed as such. Handling these issue well requires training that student researchers and, quite often, their supervisors do not have.

Conclusions: Issues identified can be counteracted by viewing ethics as a dynamic process and by taking personal responsibility for ensuring ethically sound practice. Ways in which this can be achieved will be discussed alongside how Psychology researchers can learn from collaborative and cross discipline approaches to the ethical process.

Session 3D (S3D)

Ethics across the research process - researcher perspectives

Paper 1: Language decisions as ethical dilemmas at all stages of research

Speaker(s): Gabriela Meier

Keywords: language, multilingualism, ethics, research

Abstract: Many academics will be familiar with the situation of working in an English-dominated research culture but are collecting data in different languages and generate findings and recommendations that are potentially useful for societies in non-English dominant or linguistically diverse contexts. In this talk, I will talk about the outcomes of a recent asynchronous online study phase hosted by the University of Exeter. This took place in the framework of ENROPE (an Erasmus+ project 2019-2021, co-funded by the European Union), in which the University of Exeter has been a partner. This had the aim to reflect on and discuss challenges related to research processes, specifically from a language perspective. The cohort consisted of a group of 64 researchers from different countries with diverse language backgrounds who were at different stages in their academic careers. The outcomes of our online-discussions showed that language decisions researchers inevitably have to make in their research journey had ethical implications at all levels of research: Literature review, data collection, analysis, writing up and dissemination. In this talk I will offer insights into our online discussions, point to some tools that have been developed during the project that help researchers reflect on language-related ethical dilemmas. One of the participants concluded that they plan to review their ethics criteria based on the discussions that took place during this online study phase. This leads me to open a discussion with colleagues as to how language decisions are discussed and considered as ethical dilemmas in our respective institutions.

Session 3D (S3D)

Paper 2: Moral imagination as a way of resolving ethical dilemmas in qualitative social research

Speaker(s): Adrianna Surmiak

Keywords: moral imagination; ethical dilemmas; qualitative social research; qualitative research ethics; Polish researchers

Abstract: Despite the increasing formalisation of research ethics, ethical dilemmas are not diminishing, as evidenced by the growing literature on them. In the literature one can often come across opinions that in solving ethical dilemmas researchers can be helped by being more reflexive. Reflexivity is understood as a continuous process of critical analysis of the research situation, one's own behaviour, feelings, values and the salience of demographic and personality traits and how these affect the research process (especially the acquired knowledge) and the people involved in it. However, in presentation I point out that reflexivity is a key and necessary but not sufficient condition for solving ethical dilemmas and problems in qualitative social research. Researchers also need a moral imagination, which following Patricia Werhane I define as the ability to imagine different points of view on a given situation, different options for action and their consequences, as well as evaluating possibilities (Werhane's, 1999; Werhane & Moriarty, 2009).

The aim of my presentation is to show how Patricia H. Werhane's concept of moral imagination designed for business ethics can be adapted for addressing ethical dilemmas in social qualitative research. The paper draws on in-depth interviews with 56 Polish social researchers. The interviews generally focused on the researchers’ experiences and opinions about the ethical practices and dilemmas in qualitative research with vulnerable participants. Referring to specific examples from research practice, I analyse the possibilities of using moral imagination in solving ethical dilemmas. "

Session 3D (S3D)

Paper 3: Is embedded research (more) ethical?

Speaker(s): Léna Prouchet

Keywords: ethics, embedded research, Non-Governmental Organisation, conservation, knowledge co-production

Abstract: Humanity is currently faced with a variety of crises, including, but not limited to, global warming and biodiversity loss. In this context, it has been argued that knowledge production should be more “demand-driven” (Barnes and Van Laerhoven, 2014:11). Academic researchers should primarily seek to support practitioners from public, private, and third sectors, and provide them with useful data and recommendations that can contribute to addressing the current challenges we are confronted with. To achieve this goal, embedded research has gained increased attention in recent years as it can be a powerful “action-oriented tool” (Lewis and Russell, 2011: 413). In this approach, although the researchers are not directly employed by the organisation they are investigating, they are “some kind of team members” (Reiter-Theil, 2004: 23). While embeddedness allows creating trust and rapport with participants, it also raises crucial ethical questions, related, for instance, to the researchers' critical distance (Rowley, 2014).

Therefore, in our paper, we ask: What are the ethical challenges and benefits of the embedded positionality? What are the strategies that can be developed to minimise ethical issues? The topic of embedded research and its ethical implications have received little attention in the academic conservation literature. This paper aims to address this gap since this approach has been presented as a means to “increase the impact and policy relevance of conservation research” (Jenkins et al, 2012: 740). The presentation introduces a research project founded on a collaboration between a doctoral researcher and a conservation charity. It details the iterative process of creating research and work relationships between the student and the host organisation. Furthermore, by reflecting on the definition and the underlying concepts of ‘ethical research’, it is argued that, despite the ethical questioning inherent to its nature, this approach can be a more ethical way of doing research. Finally, we present some guidelines that can support the development of such partnerships while minimising ethical concerns.

Session 3E (S3E)

Political accountability and intercultural communication in education: the paving towards new, more ethical societies

Paper 1: Reflexivity and Sensitivity: Researching the Perceptions of UK students on Identities and Cultural Diversity

Speaker(s): Mona Helmi

Keywords: Intercultural communication, awareness, identity, Willingness to communicate

Abstract: In literature, little research was found probing the status of UK students' awareness of identities, cultural diversity and their communication patterns and friendship with international students in their intercultural context in Higher Education. The ethical issues around this kind of topic, ethnic and cultural discipline, are usually sensitive and require high attentiveness to the procedures and the details in every stage of the research. When UK students expressed their understanding of identities, cultures and values, they also showed an account of self-awareness, which resulted in a dialogue that is infused with high degree of emotions and required maintain sensitivity to cultural and social differences. One of the top policies applied whilst collecting the data to meet ethical and legal obligations toward participants was confidentiality of the narratives of participants. Other ethical challenges were faced underpinning other issues, such as when interpreting and reporting the dialogue of the students as the data had to have the necessary balance between objectivity and subjectivity.

The reflexivity role emphasized the way knowledge was acquired from participants, which sometimes unfolded unexpected ethical conflicts. For instance, I was not fully aware of the ethical challenges I may face when I first decided to conduct a study on intercultural communication in a United Kingdom University. At the beginning, the mixed method study examined 184 British students in the questionnaires and explored 10 British students in the Semi-Structured Interviews. The data collection and analysis was done with full integrity by conforming to the ethical guidelines. The participants' answers were reported honestly, avoiding bias in any aspect of the research and protecting the participants' identity and privacy. However, the occurrence of a huge gap between white British and mixed British perceptions on identity and culture caused unexpected focus shift from British and international students to British and British students, thus, the reliability and validity of all collected data had to be reviewed a number of times. The study finally resulted in six major influences and implications that need further discussion and attention: The British identity quandary, black British history, Brexit, British students' impression of international students' language competency, friendship formation between white British and international students and the role of the University in resolving intercultural communication challenges. Resolving these current issues may result in well-rounded academic and social experiences for both UK and international students.

Session 3E (S3E)

Paper 2: Is Ethics Pertinent to Politics?

Speaker(s): Dr. Swati Bijawat

Keywords: Politics, Ethics, Solicitation, Honesty, Values, Justice

Abstract: Politics is an essential activity in building societies and communities based on laws and to create a balance in conflicting interests of the various stakeholders of the society. Ethics in politics is omnipresent it refers to a code of conduct regulating and instructing the behaviour of the leaders indulged in the political profession. Ethics adds a decisive value to politics by securing fair treatment of political leaders, stressing equity and fairness, reminding us that the limitations of power are essential in politics. This interpretation includes the nature of interactions along with the duty and obligations owed by the political leader to the widespread population in each culture. The political leaders are charged with the mandate of offering their service to the common people without conflict, discrimination, solicitation and misappropriation of civic funds. On common grounds, politics demands respect and commitment especially in terms of democracies.

A trust in the same is essential for the existence of various societies coherently. But unwarranted practices can be found everywhere an overlook of the same portrays a complete opposite image of the political leaders. The so-called representative of “Common Man” are often seen as solicited, fixers and corrupt instead of working for the welfare of the wider population often the political leaders emerged as selfish and dishonest. In contrast to all the negativity many politicians with honest attitude and intentions are trying to give their best to empower the mass population. In recent years’ multiple political initiatives, policies and movements are being initiated to re-establish trust and acceptance making a difference in the thinking of people. This article is an assertion i.e. YES, ethics in politics do exist and it is not an impossible dream to achieve. By presenting case studies and practical examples the strong affirmation of the same would be established that the existence of ethical values in politics is not a "Utopia" rather a tool for establishing Justice and morality in the Political System of multicultural societies.

Workshop 3A (W3A)

Ethical considerations of qualitative secondary analysis (Part 2).

This workshop considers ethical concerns when conducting secondary qualitative data analysis and making qualitative data available to others for re-analysis hosted by Helen Foster-Collins

During Part 2, there will be an opportunity to do some hands-on activities, ask questions and discuss any ethical dilemmas you may have relating to current or proposed research, re-using qualitative data.

Hosted by: Dr Helen Foster-Collins

Keywords: qualitative data, secondary analysis, ethical implications, participant confidentiality, context-dependent data

Abstract: Secondary analysis can be defined as any further analysis of an existing data set ‘which presents interpretations, conclusions or knowledge additional to, or different from, those presented in the first report’ (Hakim, 1982). Secondary analysis can be conducted as a re-examination of one’s own research data, or upon data obtained from various third-party sources, such as sharing of data between collaborative research groups or from data archives. The use of secondary qualitative data has seen increased emphasis in recent years, with increased availability of data through stipulations by funding bodies to share data once research is complete, and active promotion through funding sources targeted at research projects which have secondary analysis as a central feature (e.g. ESRC, 2018). However, the ethical issues faced when re-analysing qualitative data differ to those arising from re-use of quantitative data, and it can helpful for researchers to be aware of these complex issues right from the planning stages.

This workshop considers what ethical concerns we might encounter as researchers, in relation to:

conducting a secondary analysis of qualitative data, and

making our qualitative data available to others for re-analysis as well as thinking too about the ‘ethical positives’ of secondary analysis in qualitative research.

This two-hour workshop will consist of:

a short presentation, outlining some of the dilemmas we may encounter when undertaking secondary analysis or making our data available to others. This will be illustrated with examples from my own PhD research in teacher and medical education.

a hands-on workshop where attendees can think about how they would approach such issues, using worked examples.

time for questions and open discussion regarding attendees’ current or planned research which utilises secondary data.

Topics addressed will include: the potential advantages and drawbacks of secondary analyses of qualitative data, and ethical issues relating to participant consent, confidentiality and anonymisation, and the context dependent nature of qualitative data.

The aims of this workshop are that attendees will better understand the ethical implications of conducting secondary analysis on qualitative data, to aid them in designing and carrying out secondary analysis in their own research, and for planning to share their data with other researchers.

Hakim, C. (1982). Secondary analysis in social research: A guide to data sources and methods with examples. Allen and Unwin/Unwin Hyman.

ESRC 2021. Secondary Data Analysis Initiative. https://esrc.ukri.org/research/our-research/secondary-data-analysis-initiative/

Workshop 3C (W3C)

Mental Capacity and Consent – ethical considerations when a person lacks capacity to consent.

Hosted by: Paul Kenny

Abstract: A Workshop hosted by Paul Kenny who originally qualified as a barrister, worked in Private International Law for many years and has in recent years practised as an adult social worker dealing with matters relating to mental capacity on a daily basis.

AIMS

It is proposed that there will be an open discussion around the legal and ethical issues involved with research into people who may lack the capacity to give consent or informed consent.

Explore why we have laws in relation to Mental Capacity. How we have the right to self-determination and from an ethical perspective - autonomy, and the choice of being able to be able to consent or not.

WHAT WE WILL COVER

The initial exploration will be of the requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 and how it may apply to consent. Also, we will look at the Equality Act 2010, and the requirement not to discriminate against a person due to a protected characteristic. There will be a brief discussion of children and consent, parental responsibility, case law and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Then there will be an outline of the background to, and requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 which is the governing legislation in this area. We will explore how the MCA has its own ‘ethical’ features running throughout and some ethical issues which arise in its implementation.

It is anticipated that the ethical considerations in relation to consent will have emerged during the discussions. However, the session will end with a discussion of the usual ethics relevant to consent and how they may apply in the situation of person lacking capacity.

OUTCOMES

Hopefully, participants will be able to confidently apply the MCA in research situations if they take this learning further.

Participants will determine and share a greater awareness of the application of research ethics where participants may lack the capacity to consent.

Session 4A (S4A)

Promising Platforms or Digital Dangers?: Navigating Ethics in the virtual world

Paper 1: Covert Research and Networked Harassment: A Holistic Review

Speaker(s): Antonia Vaughan

Keywords: alt right; covert; networked harassment; safety

Abstract: The alt right online has a consistent record of networked harassment, particularly targeting academics who research the far right and adjacent topics (such as the manosphere and gaming; see Gamergate and #OperationDiggingDiGRA). It is an inevitable risk of being present online, particularly for those already on the sharp end of far right discourse. The structure of social platforms and their highly digital nature makes researchers increasingly vulnerable to harassment; not only are they accessible through a simple search, but the alt right can trawl the internet to build a precise profile. This is compounded by the pressure from institutions and funding bodies to develop a public presence, which Massanari terms as the culture of 'microcelebrity' (2019). Massanari (2019) has highlighted how this new environment has challenged traditional ethics procedures that focus on disclosure and informed consent with little guidance provided by sources such as funding bodies and research institutions.

This paper provides such a critical holistic consideration of covert research to incorporate both safety and the issue of consent Current ethical guidance fails to appropriately situate ethical considerations within this developing environment.

The option of covert research – which protects the researcher from the hostile communities for as long as possible – is subsumed into sections on consent rather than taking a holistic approach that involves consideration of the security and safety of the researcher. The paper argues that whilst the participant's safety and rights should be of primordial concern, we need to expand our scope to reflexively consider the environment we work in beyond the specific site of research. Frequently, the power balance tips to the alt right, with the highly visible researcher subject to a shadowy swarm. The threat to the researcher goes beyond the specific sites of research to the dissemination, with alt-right figures picking up new targets by discovering publications. This paper argues that in order to protect researchers doing critical work, we need to reconceptualise covert research in this environment away from a taboo option-of-last-resort, to an overt practice with associated guidance and reflections.

Session 4A (S4A)

Paper 2: Situational ethics in pandemics: Issues with using online messaging Apps in the context of sensitive topics in Colombia

Speaker(s): Estrada-Jaramillo, Ana Lucia

Keywords: Situational ethics, sensitive topics, Latin America, messaging Apps.

Abstract: The use of online methodologies always requires careful attention to confidentiality and security principles, made more acute in the current pandemic and when dealing with sensitive topics like Congenital Syphilis prevention in Colombia. I argue for a situational ethics approach (Warrell and Jacobsen, 2014; Halford, 2017; Snee, 2013) allowing the flexibility of navigating through the constant changing landscapes of online research, mainly when using Messaging Apps as my research shows. As ongoing fieldwork research, my research relies heavily on the use of WhatsApp to reach out to vulnerable populations who might otherwise not participate in research. I also use WhatsApp to conduct interviews, asynchronous focus groups and diaries with different stakeholders (health care workers, health care administrators, pregnant women, partners and relatives). Several advantages are found while using WhatsApp for research. Besides being widely used among vulnerable populations, it allows us to discuss topics at participants´ own pace and express themselves limiting social compliance. Although several measures have been put in place to conduct fieldwork to warranty participants´ anonymity and confidentiality; the latest changes to the Terms and Conditions stated by WhatsApp for their users in some countries as Colombia might compromise those principles.

The new conditions refer to sharing information with Facebook companies and business that use their services. Information such as mobile numbers, IP addresses, location, other contacts´ numbers, transactions and payments do through the App and frequency, time and duration of interactions among users (business and enterprises included). Recently, there have been allegations of security issues such as mobile´s numbers appearing on Google search. Therefore, many Latin American users are migrating to other Message Apps such as Telegram or Signal who have different characteristics in terms of system architecture and security settings but have not been assessed by our institutional Ethics Committee. A situational ethics approach will allow to follow ethics principles while adapting the research methodology and trialling the use of new Apps. Therefore, it will keep up with the sudden shifts that technology has in which ethics committees’ knowledge of apps' security is likely to lag.

Session 4A (S4A)

Paper 3: Negotiating mobile phone-based gendered mobility analyses using feminist research ethics and practice

Speaker(s): Arthur Vandervoort

Keywords: gender data, mobile phone data, data feminism, natural disasters, gendered mobility

Abstract: Situated at the intersection between feminist epistemology, data justice, and critical data studies, the data feminism literature provides a uniquely suitable framework for informing both the evaluation and development of data-intensive research in dynamic and contested spaces. Feminist scholars and activists have long emphasised the importance of capturing “everyday spatial practices” as a key element of identifying the gendered dimension of mobility (Fuentes and Cookson, 2020). Thanks to the digital trace data generated by the near-ubiquity of mobile phones, such everyday spatial dynamics are now accessible for quantification and empirical analysis at an unprecedented scale (Cookson et al., 2020; Taylor, 2016a). Such digital trace data are associated with serious concerns regarding user privacy, data accessibility, and representability (de Montjoye et al., 2018; Taylor, 2016b), as well as requiring significant data processing in order to be usable (Barbosa et al., 2018). Because of this, researchers have highlighted the need for “adequate normative frameworks” to integrate mobile phone data into the gender data toolkit (Abreu Lopes and Bailur, 2018).

This paper seeks to address this need by outlining how data feminism combines a feminist analysis of the relationship between knowledge production and power with a data justice-inspired framework for informing emancipatory data work into a useable data science praxis, applicable to both routine instances of data work and high-level analyses of research projects and their wider contexts (Green, 2020). Looking towards the humanitarian contexts mobile phone-based mobility research is often situated in, this paper presents an approach to evaluate “big gender data” research while also responding to calls for more feminist conversations within the big-data community (Vaitla et al., 2020).

Session 4C (S4C)

Consent Conundrums: Challenges obtaining consent in different contexts

Paper 1: Employees and big data: a virtue ethical approach

Speaker(s): Lisa Grover

Keywords: informed consent, employees, big data, autonomy, virtue ethics, trustworthiness

Abstract: Can an employee give informed consent for the use of their data in big data analytics? Is their consent enough to make sure that this use is ethical? My work focuses on answering these questions. Big data is a term that describes larger, more complex data sets. HR data analytics is beginning to use big data. For example, using big data to find out why employees leave a business. Understanding ethical use of employee data in this way is important. There is little yet written about informed consent in relation to using employee information in big data analytics. My work makes a new contribution to the literature. I press analytics professionals to think deeply about the ethical use of employee data. I challenge the belief that informed consent makes the use of data ethical. Instead, I propose a new way of thinking about the ethics of big data analysis. This draws upon the virtue of trustworthiness.

Session 4C (S4C)

Paper 2: Remote recruitment of people with dementia and carers: ethical dilemmas of an RCT study

Speaker(s): Greene, L., Oh, TM., Manger, L., Gude, A., Weston, L., Sutcliffe, C., Batool, S., Beresford, R., Griffiths, S., Wheat, H., Sherriff, I., Clarkson, P., & Byng, R.

Keywords: Capacity, dementia, RCT, consent, consultee, remote

Abstract: The Dementia Person Aligned Care Team (D-PACT) is an NIHR funded collaboration between the University of Plymouth and the University of Manchester. D-PACT aims to develop and evaluate a person-centred Dementia Support Worker intervention based in primary care for people living with dementia and their carers. The original COVID-19 lockdown resulted in D-PACT developing a flexible recruitment process, enabling us to work remotely during the pandemic. We aim to share our learning and contribute to the ongoing debate about maintaining rigorous ethical practices whilst embedding person-centred approaches throughout remote research processes.

Ethical challenges and learning/solutions

A number of ethical challenges were identified and solutions developed. For example:

A need to develop suitable remote materials was acknowledged, accounting for age-related factors (e.g. visual/auditory impairments and fatigue) as well as dementia-specific challenges (e.g. cognitive/communication impairments). This work can be supported by working closely with PPI groups and ensuring choices are informed by guidance on dementia-friendly communication.

There was little guidance on gaining verbal consent with a heavy focus on e-consent which can alienate older adults. DPACT received REC/HRA approval to obtain verbal consent. This was well accepted by participants.

Judging capacity over video/phone call and starting a conversation about obtaining consultee agreement was challenging. There was a paucity of literature on remote capacity judgements for the team to base their decision on. Our learning suggests it is helpful to have an initial guide, although experience led to a more person-centred/flexible capacity judging approach. Building rapport and gathering information from the first point of contact was crucial and, although time-consuming, should not be rushed. Videoconferencing further facilitated rapport building and recruitment processes, but many individuals did not have access to IT equipment.

Working with socially isolated adults during COVID-19. Having details of local services for participants and utilizing peer supervision/reflective practice.

Conclusions: Remote recruitment has been successfully and ethically implemented but research processes were protracted. Future research should be mindful of this. Remote capacity judgements are feasible but can be challenging and researchers may need extra support. Gathering information from the initial point of contact to help build a comprehensive picture of capacity is helpful. Consideration should be given to the effects of COVID-19 on both participants and researchers.

Session 4C (S4C)

Paper 3: Ethical approval for use of un-consented human tissues: a clinical research experience.

Speaker(s): Dr Ollie Rupar

Keywords: Archived human tissue, Ethical approval process.

Abstract: All human tissue samples assessed for diagnostic purposes within the NHS are kept for thirty years, yet the vast majority are (currently) not used in clinical research. In cases of aggressive malignancies, such as primary liver cancer, it has been possible to release these archived specimens for use in research provided rigorous ethical processes, and appropriate research methodologies, are adhered to. Access to these tumour samples has only been possible following ethical approval by the research ethics committee. This has allowed an otherwise untapped research resource to be used for the first time in Devon and Cornwall.

The Clinical Conundrum: Consent for use of these tissues has been granted on behalf of patients, meaning it is possible to undertake research on human tissue without express written, informed consent from the patient. Several ethical issues were raised in the process of gaining ethical approval that necessitated input from both local and national bodies. These included the health research authority (HRA), the research ethics committee (REC), exploring a confidentiality advisory group (CAG), input from a local patient participation group and the hospital Caldicott Guardian. Special dispensation for undertaking this research was approved given the terrible 5-year survival rate (15%), the urgent need for better understanding of the biology of these cancers, and that research would not deplete the tumour samples. Strict stipulations were adhered to alongside ensuring minimal patient-identifiable data was accessed and was only made possible with the help of the local Histopathology department.

Conclusion: This approach was used successfully and made possible by close liaison between various ethical bodies, the hospital research and development department and the study sponsor. It has been a privilege to have access to these archived resection specimens and it is hoped this example can serve as a demonstration for potential future research opportunities. The vast source of archived tissues that are currently held in storage can be used as raw research material in centres that may not have either the capacity, time or funding to create their own fresh tissue bio bank. One particular benefit of using archived material being that long-term survival data can be readily extracted from patient records, allowing clinically significant correlations, and results, to become apparent when comparing tumour mutations, or when comparing protein expression with survival data.

Session 4D (S4D)

Many ways of knowing: Methods as ethical responses to marginalised and indigenous knowledges

Paper 1: A decolonial art-led research within an ecology of care: from Ethics to Risk Assessment

Speaker(s): Livia Daza-Paris

Keywords: Decolonizing, methodologies, ethics, ecology of care, art-led research, Venezuela.

Abstract: For the Decolonizing section of your Ethics Conference, you ask: How can we decolonize ethics? In your call, you encourage contributions that may be inspired by our own practice, critical theories and experience. I propose to discuss your timely concerns through a paper on my current interdisciplinary art-led research guided by a plurality of ways of knowing (Kimmerer 2003) that is imbued with principles of Indigenous knowledge. The research ethics draw from decolonizing methodologies (Tuhawi Smith 1999), upholding relational accountability (Wilson 2008) between me, a mestiza Venezuelan artist/researcher and my collaborators who are Venezuelan campesinos: rural people of mestizo descent1. Importantly, these relational ethics expand to place and land, including the human and the nonhuman in an “ecology of care” (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017, Dufourmantelle 2018) that emerges from a practice immersed in art as research.

This art-led research investigates a non-official history from the 1960s Cold-War era, specific to rural north-west Venezuela, that is embedded in colonialism, imperialism, state violence and political disappearances (Amnesty International 1993); this marginalized history has directly affected my life as well as the lives of the campesinos.

I propose to present a case study of the ethics and risk assessment presented in my research developed through decolonizing methodologies and axiologies in resonance with somatic practices. I hope that this will function in two ways: firstly, that it stands alone as an example of decolonizing ethics; secondly, that it presents a sharp contrast to the restricted set of normative models for methodology, ethics and risk assessment offered by the university—and that persist in Eurocentric academic research. It is my wish that by presenting the context and process wherein these ethics developed might offer the following contributions: to expand perspectives on the persistent biases surrounding knowledge production; and to further conversations on the pedagogical shifts necessary to respond to the urgent decolonial turn (Todd 2016).

Session 4D (S4D)

Paper 2: Exploring Colombian marginalised youth voices within páramo social-ecological systems to understand the impacts of environmental risks on youth resilience

Speaker(s): Nicholas Marais Reyneke

Keywords: social-ecological systems, resilience, marginalised youth, environmental risk, páramos, and participatory research.

Abstract: By drawing on elements from resilience thinking within a social-ecological system (SES), this research explores the inclusion of socially marginalised youth and their knowledge to understand the impacts of environmental risk on youth resilience. A novel approach in participatory research is applied with a case study in the Colombian Tropical Andes. This approach will give a group of socially marginalised youth from an impoverished community living on the fringes of a páramo their first opportunity to represent themselves in environmental decision-making processes. Páramos are considered a primary freshwater source for people living in the Colombian Tropical Andes. Young people's voices in these SESs will explore participatory research, including participatory mapping and photography, spatial image capture via uncrewed aerial vehicles, and innovative technology. These methods support an approach to SES research that seeks better to understand existing SES frameworks and marginalised youth knowledge.

Session 4D (S4D)

Paper 3: The Visible Traces of Bias: The Disruption of CanLit's Status Quo

Speaker(s): Heather Simeney MacLeod

Keywords: Indigenous, CanLit, Canadian Literature, race relations, BIPOC, classism

Abstract: In the past several years, Canadian literature (CanLit) has undergone unprecedented and public internal divisions that, though revolving around recent controversies, emerged from the deep waters of Canada's, often unaddressed and ignored, inequities across gender, race, and class. The controversies ranging from allegations of sexual assault and bullying from a Chair of a prestigious Creative Writing program to Canada's go-to Indigenous writer and spokesperson's Indigeneity revealed as absent to Canada's most powerful people within media suggesting an appropriation prize for white writers should be funded, Canadian literature's unethical corporeality had revealed itself. A collection of essays, tweets, storifies, and creative writing from many marginalized Canadians emerged from print, online publication, blogs, and social media addressing, as one writer referred to it, the raging dumpster fire of CanLit. Responding to the furor, Hannah McGregor, Julie Rak, and Erin Wunker edited ReFuse: CanLit in Ruins. What might make CanLit unique from other national literary communities is its size. The community spans the length and breadth of a continent and numbers, like its population, a few. In the wading pool of CanLit, its unethical breaches have been tsunamis to BIPOC, as well as to LGBTQ communities, and to the class system writ large within the CanLit controversies.

I suggest an ethical approach has been difficult within CanLit just as it is difficult within the nation of Canada, for both entities have prided themselves upon their diversity, liberal notions, and left-wing ruminations. The disruption of CanLit’s status quo may offer an approach to ethics long-missing within CanLit. Mending these ruptures within CanLit and ensuring it is not symbolic, not erasable but material and tangible requires an ethical approach. I suggest this paradigm shift within CanLit may benefit from implementing cultural currency. As Juanita Sherwood indicates, ""Cultural competence is the ability to participate ethically and effectively in personal and professional intercultural settings. It requires being aware of one's own cultural values and world view and their implications for making respectful, reflective and reasoned choices, including the capacity to imagine and collaborate across cultural boundaries"" (Sherwood n. pag.). As Canada and CanLit by extension has relied upon the political rhetoric of embracing diversity by enacting and carrying out cultural currency and collaboration is an ethical course of action for CanLit to not only embrace diversity but to reckon with it and fuse it within its community, industry, cultural field, and academic discipline.

Session 4E (S4E)

GSE Ethics Special Interest Group Roundtable

Speaker(s): Alice Potter and Wafa Almulaifi

Keywords: Ethical implications, challenges, dilemmas.

Abstract: Ethics in research is a diverse and important topic. While research is incredibly broad, there are commonalities that span many research topics regarding ethical practice. These might include the challenges of working with young people or other vulnerable groups, gaining meaningful consent, and ensuring accessible dissemination practices.For example, collaboration is one of the ethical issues that may be faced throughout any study. Therefore, as researchers, we should make sure that our positions or experiences in the field do not affect the study agenda by imposing our political and economic ideas on participants. Researchers should also avoid devaluing stakeholders' work or letting participants think of them as their saviours. As researchers, we should clarify to all participants that we intend to investigate problems and help stakeholders find solutions.

The Graduate School of Education Ethics Special Interest Group invites you to our roundtable discussion. This session will be an opportunity to share ethical successes and challenges that we have encountered in our research.

This session is aimed at anyone with a research interest; this might include novice and experienced academic researchers, practitioners, or anyone else with interest. We invite participants to share current or past research projects and reflect on their practice in discussion with colleagues.

Exeter University is a multi-national and multi-cultural institution; thus, this session offers the opportunity to discuss ethical practice from an international perspective and the particular challenges this affords.

Workshop 4A (W4A)

Problematizing the Ethics Process: An Anthrozoological Perspective

Hosted by: Jes Hooper, Michelle Szydlowski, Kris Hill & Sarah Heaney

Keywords: Animals in Research, Anthrozoology, Problematizing Ethics

Abstract: Anthrozoology is an emergent field concerned with the study of human-animal interactions and relationships. As an emergent interdisciplinary field, Anthrozoology is in its infancy regarding methodological practice. For Anthrozoologists, research involves both human and animal as active participants and actors within ethnographic investigation. Concerned with the ethical implications of research beyond the human species, Anthrozoologists are often faced with navigating how to protect both human and non-human informants, and when to speak for animals. Anthrozoology therefore presents a unique lens through which to view current research ethics processes. Held by postgraduate researchers from Exeter's Anthrozoology as Symbiotic Ethics (EASE) working group, the proposed workshop aims to problematize the Ethics Committee process in order to suggest solutions to better protect the interests of animal participants.

Through the mode of a discussion forum, the attendees will be asked to share their own experiences of the Ethics Committee process whilst considering how the traditional ethics committee paradigm, as derived from the Biological Sciences, no longer adequately considers the nuances presented within animal related research. The workshop will conclude with a collaboration between participants and speakers in order to problem solve and propose alternative ways in which the Ethics Committee process can better address the concerns of animals involved in research.

Notes on the source material

This booklet reproduces the text available on the 27 published REC2021 session and workshop abstract pages: 19 session pages and 8 workshop pages. The original wording, speaker details, keywords and references have been retained where provided. Line breaks and typography have been standardised. Affiliations absent from the source have not been added.

The two decolonising education research pages (Sessions 2C and 3B) each contain all five symposium papers. In this booklet, papers 1–3 appear under Session 2C and papers 4–5 under Session 3B, following the programme allocation. The source paper numbers are retained. The shared panel introduction is included in both sessions.

Workshop 1B has a published abstract page and appears in the programme, although it is absent from the abstracts index. It is included here. The programme also lists the same drop-in ethical applications advice in Workshops 2D and 3D; no separate abstract pages for these slots are listed in the published site data. See Workshop 1B for the available abstract.

The abstracts index labels Mental Capacity and Consent as Workshop 3B; the linked abstract page and programme label it Workshop 3C. This booklet follows the abstract page and programme.

The index lists a later LEGO Serious Play workshop as Workshop 4B, but its link leads to the site homepage. The programme labels the later workshop Workshop 4C. No separate abstract page is listed in the published site data. The available LEGO Serious Play abstract is included under Workshop 2B; a distinct later abstract cannot be confirmed.

The title of Mona Helmi’s Workshop 2C differs between the index/programme and the abstract page. The abstract-page title is retained. Session 4D includes Nicholas Marais Reyneke’s abstract, which is present on the abstract page but absent from the programme listing.

The programme names keynote presentations by Dr Foluke Adebisi and Professor Sabina Leonelli, but its information links lead to the homepage. No keynote abstract text was recovered from these links. This booklet covers the session and workshop abstract pages, rather than reproducing the conference timetable or poster gallery.

Source pages were retrieved on 4 November 2026. The source list below records the published pages used.

Source pages

Abstracts index
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-abstracts

Conference programme
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-programme

Session 1A (S1A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s1a-abstracts

Session 1B (S1B)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s1b-abstracts

Session 1C (S1C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s1c-abstracts

Session 1D (S1D)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s1d-abstracts

Session 1E (S1E)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s1e-abstracts

Workshop 1A (W1A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w1a-abstracts

Workshop 1B (W1B)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w1b-abstracts

Session 2A (S2A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s2a-abstracts

Session 2B (S2B)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s2b-abstracts

Session 2C (S2C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s2c-abstracts

Session 2D (S2D)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s2d-abstracts

Session 2E (S2E)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s2e-abstracts

Workshop 2A (W2A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w2a-abstracts

Workshop 2B (W2B)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w2b-abstracts

Workshop 2C (W2C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w2c-abstracts

Session 3A (S3A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s3a-abstracts

Session 3B (S3B)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s3b-abstracts

Session 3C (S3C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s3c-abstracts

Session 3D (S3D)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s3d-abstracts

Session 3E (S3E)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s3e-abstracts

Workshop 3A (W3A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w3a-abstracts

Workshop 3C (W3C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w3c-abstracts

Session 4A (S4A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s4a-abstracts

Session 4C (S4C)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s4c-abstracts

Session 4D (S4D)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s4d-abstracts

Session 4E (S4E)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-s4e-abstracts

Workshop 4A (W4A)
https://warrenspeed.wixsite.com/my-site-2/rec2021-w4a-abstracts