Research Ethics | January/February 2018　　　　　　　　View this email in your browser

Didn't receive this edition directly? Please visit https://www.ahrecs.com and enter your email address in the space provided at the bottom. Our merry extrinsically motivated team will be thrilled.

Don't mention the c word: Covert research and the stifling ethics regime in the social

Covert research is associated with deliberate deception in social research and equated with harm and risk researcher, the researched, the institution and the field. It is a controversial and emotive tradition that runs cou and violates the received orthodoxy and professional mantra of informed consent enshrined in various committees, institutional review boards and professional codes of practice. It is a methodological pariah an resort position that is frowned upon, submerged, marginalized, stigmatized and effectively demonized (Calvey, in the social sciences. Indeed, to some in that community, to even contemplate a covert move is a belligerent st far, which displays a cavalier attitude and belligerent lack of ethics. This view of deliberate misrepresentation (E 1967) accurately represents the received tone of much of the debate around covert research for a lengthy pe time. For many, despite the growing critical literature on informed consent as ideologically idealistic and disconi from field realities, this derogatory and simplistic characterization of covert research has not altered.

I call for a fairer reading of the covert tradition and, hopefully in turn, a greater appreciation and recognition disruptive and invigorating role that covert research has brought to the social sciences. By using covert researc

enters into an ethical labyrinth and moral minefield, saturated in ethical dilemmas and puzzles, but it do automatically follow that covert researchers have no ethical conscience. Often what are displayed are complex self-regulations and guilt syndromes. Ethics then becomes a situated matter of application as well as a te understanding. What is partly called for is a broader and more nuanced way of understanding research eth practice.

From my own covert ethnography of bouncers in the night-time economy of Manchester, I experienced a se ethical moments around witnessing violence and gaining deviant knowledge, that I managed in the field. Part sustained passing in the setting was accepting and not altering their moral code and sensibility about events though I might have a different personal interpretation. After my lived experience of six months as a covert no bouncer doing different doors in the city, I felt that I had a richer appreciation of their subcultural values and c realities. Part of my investigation was in debunking the moral panics and stigma around bouncing being by them from the inside.

Read more

Use of Imported Human Biospecimens in Research

The use of biospecimens in research is a vital tool in the development of knowledge and innovation in biom research. There are a number of established biobanks, local and international, that offer a rich resource of l biospecimens for research purposes[1]. In most cases these resources are linked with genetic and/or other pe health information.

There is a vast amount of literature that comments on the ethical and legal challenges involved in bioba including the collection, processing and sourcing of biospecimens[2]. This blog post addresses the ty information that Australian HRECs and researchers require to establish the ethical acceptability of research inv the use of biospecimens, particularly where the samples are sourced and imported from an international supplie

In Australia, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) National Statement on Ethical Con Human Research, 2013 (National Statement), Chapter 3.4 on Human Biospecimens in Laboratory Based Rese refers to human biospecimens as 'any biological material obtained from a person including tissue, blood, sputum and any derivative from these including cell lines' and outlines the ethical considerations for the coll storage and use of biospecimens in research.

Read more

What's at risk? Who's responsible? Moving beyond the physical, the immediate, the proximate, and the individual

Building the Conversation

This month's addition to the **Building the Conversation** series reflects upon how we approach risks beyond thos that are physical, harm people other than a project's participants and harms that are not immediate.

To some extent, when researchers reflect
those harms associated with a project, the
well limit their assessment of risk to the he
now and to identifiable individuals. In additi
projects in the medical sciences, those risk
long understood as predominantly physical
form of injury, infection or disability and rela
direct participants (e.g. persons who receiv
experimental pharmacological agent). This
vision is not particularly surprising. One
perverse consequences of requiring researc
reflect on whether the potential benefits of re
justify risk to participants is that some resea
are dissuaded from looking too carefully fo
and therefore avoid developing strategies for minimising these risks and mitigating possible harms. Even
perversely, this reluctance can trigger in human research ethics committees an unrealistic level of risk aversion.

Read more

You May Have Missed...

Some changes to the AHRECS team including Sarah Byrne and Barry Smith joining as consultants. A major up
the Our Services section.

BLOG

    (i) Magical incantations and the tyranny of the template;

    (ii) How can we get mentors and trainees talking about ethical challenges?;

    (iii) Ethical use of social media as a recruitment tool;

    (iv) Ethical research with young children: Whose research, whose agenda?; and

    (v) A Model for the Participation of Indigenous Children and Young People in Research.

RESOURCE LIBRARY

    Calls for **expressions of interest**. There are now over a thousand items in the Resource
Library (www.ahrecs.com/resources). We're looking for a generous and experienced soul who could help
us curate the library. Please send your expression of interest to library@ahrecs.com.

(i) Video: Life Sciences Quarterly: The Use of Social Media and Mobile Applications in Clinical Trials & Recent
Developments in Research Fraud;

(ii) The Rush to Publication: An Editorial and Scientific Mistake;

(iii) Rethinking Informed Consent in Biobanking and Biomedical Research: a Taiwanese Aboriginal Perspective
the Implementation of Group Consultation;

(iv) The Three Dilemmas of Data Gathering; and

(v) Authorship and Team Science.

You can this post and earlier posts at www.ahrecs.com/blog

Do you know someone
who hasn't subscribed
yet to the Research
Ethics Monthly?
Please encourage them
to subscribe now and
help us grow this
community

Got an idea
for a post
or a suggestion
for a guest?

Send an email to
gary@ahrecs.com

Do you have a view,
feedback or some
constructive criticism on
this or other posts?
Every item has comment
link so you can have
your say and continue
the conversation.

RESOURCE LIBRARY

Have you checked out the resource library rec
New items are added daily. There are separate se
for Human Research Ethics and Research In
There are subsections for different categories of
e.g. 'In the news' and books.

We hate spam and definitely don't want to be bother you with an wanted emails.
Click here to change your subscription settings.

This newsletter is authorized by the AHRECS team, click here for contact and other details.

We would never divulge your details to anyone else, including not disclosing you're a subscriber, without your permission.