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*The Process of Social Research*, Third Edition
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Chapter 3: The Ethics and Politics of Research

Doing What’s “Right”

**Lecture and Demonstration Ideas**

**1. Ethical Issues in Two Controversial Studies**

Two controversial studies with disparate methodologies that could be used to address several ethical issues are David Rosenhan’s field research (1973) on perceptions of pseudopatients in mental hospitals and Neil Malamuth, Maggie Heim, and Seymour Feshbach’s experimental study (1980) of college students’ reactions to rape victims.

Rosenhan had eight people gain admission to twelve different mental hospitals by claiming that they were hearing voices. After gaining admission, these “pseudopatients,” none of whom had a history of psychological problems, ceased pretending to hear voices and proceeded to behave normally. With one exception, the pseudopatients were diagnosed as “schizophrenic,” and seven to fifty-two days later, when they were released, they were all were considered to be “in remission.” The diagnostic labels as well as interpretations of the pseudopatients’ behavior indicated that hospital staffs were unable to detect sanity in insane places.

The study raises several ethical issues and, indeed, was the subject of numerous letters to the editor, many from angry psychiatrists, in a subsequent issue of *Science* (Volume 180:356–69), where the study was reported. Several letters challenged Rosenhan’s methodology and interpretation of his observations, with many expressing concerns for the adverse publicity regarding psychiatric treatment and practices. Thus, the study could be discussed in relation to the problems of disseminating knowledge about research findings. The study also could be discussed with regard to its use of deception. One could question the cost of deceiving a large number of hospital staff members, especially since they did not benefit from the study through a debriefing. Did the questionably ethical practices of the study justify the insights that were gained?

Malamuth, Heim, and Feshbach conducted two experiments in which they measured various reactions of participants, including sexual arousal, to written descriptions of sexual assault. In the more controversial of the experiments, the investigators manipulated both the amount of pain experienced by the woman (pain versus no pain) and whether she experienced disgust and nausea or an involuntary orgasm. This experiment showed that an involuntary orgasm produced levels of sexual arousal in participants that were similar to those elicited by depictions of mutually consenting sex. Moreover, males were most aroused when the rape victim was portrayed as experiencing an orgasm *and* pain.

Such findings have obvious implications for current debates about the effects of pornography. As Carolyn Sherif (1980:409) pointed out, this study raises three crucial ethical issues:

1. The possible effects on the students of being exposed to “totally false” depictions of rape outcomes.
2. Communication with colleagues about alternative interpretations of findings on self-reported sexual arousal and the limited data brought to bear on these interpretations.
3. Communication through [scientific journals] to a larger public, including pro and anticensorship groups, journalists, and so on that may utilize the report for their own interests or in evaluating the psychological profession.

Despite a thorough debriefing of participants by Malamuth, Heim, and Feshbach, Sherif (1980:410) wondered whether the portrayals of sexual assault may have evoked “concern, watchful movements, and bad dreams” in female participants and what effects they might have had on the males who learned that they were sexually aroused. Such concerns suggest the need for postexperimental sessions. She also thought that the authors did not sufficiently entertain alternative explanations of the sexual arousal reported by male versus female participants. Finally, she suggested that journals might include special sections for a discussion of the policy implications of research. (Also see Malamuth, Feshbach, and Heim’s reply, 1980.)

**2. Class Demonstration of Deception**

As the text points out, the use of deception is still controversial even though professional ethical codes and federal ethical guidelines allow it. Yueping Zhang and Kevin Moore (2005) describe an active learning demonstration sure to arouse students’ interest and involvement in the topic of research ethics and deception. On the day when research ethics were to be covered, the instructor began the class by returning a recent exam. Unbeknownst to the students, scores on the exams were twelve points lower than the actual score. After returning the exams, the instructor handed out a previously scheduled faculty evaluation form (students were told earlier in the semester that there would be an interim evaluation on this day). Then, immediately “after students completed the evaluation form,” he “announced the ‘good news’ that the actual test scores were twelve points higher than the scores indicated on the exams.” Finally, the instructor began a discussion of the ethics of deception in which he pointed out that previous research had shown that grades may affect student evaluations of instructors. He proposed to students that one way to test this effect would be to manipulate test scores, as he had done, and then compare “student evaluations completed immediately and after a two-week delay.”

Zhang and Moore assessed students’ reactions to the experience of deception in two ways: through students’ participation in a class discussion following the false feedback on exam scores and through an optional reflective essay written by students two weeks later. They reported that the demonstration generated a highly animated discussion in which students eagerly shared their feelings about being deceived. Both the discussion and reflective essays indicated that students found the demonstration to be a valuable learning experience.

The demonstration could have been just as effective if students were not forewarned that they would be doing an interim instructor evaluation. In fact, one could ask students during the discussion if administering an evaluation form after returning an exam made them suspicious about the purpose of the evaluation. Then you could point out that in much the same way research participants often wonder about researchers’ purposes. Also, given the numerous problems with the study design that Zhang and Moore proposed for testing the effect of grades on evaluations, an alternative test could be explored. One could suggest to students that before administering evaluation forms, researchers could manipulate exam feedback experimentally by providing bogus feedback to half the students and accurate results to the others. This study design also would be more consistent with the use of deception in social research, which almost always occurs in experiments.

**3. Role-Playing Exercise on Ethical Issues in Field Research**

The subtleties of research ethics can be demonstrated effectively through role-playing exercises. Ralph Rosnow (1990) describes an exercise in which each student first selects an article from a professional journal that reports a study that the student feels is ethically questionable. After critically evaluating the ethics of the study, the student is asked to role-play the author of the study and defend it in the face of the student’s own and others’ criticisms.

Raymond Lee (1987) also suggests two classroom simulations involving the ethical problems confronting a field researcher. The first simulation deals with the problem of gaining access to a field setting; the second, briefly described here, deals more broadly with issues of observational strategies and the nature of the researcher’s relationship to those observed.

To begin, Lee forms students into small discussion groups. Each member of a group is given the same description of a field researcher who is trying to decide among various options for studying police practices. According to the description, which is based on an actual field study, the researcher recently has taken a leave of absence from the police to complete a degree in sociology. Now that he has returned, he is considering doing research on the police for a higher degree. He is aware of questionable police practices and of the difficulties of studying the police as an outsider. As he sees it, he has six options for doing his research (Lee, 1987:154):

1. Seek the permission of the chief officer to carry out research, giving full details of method and intention
2. Seek permission of the chief officer, so phrasing [the] research description that it disguises [the researcher’s] real intentions
3. Seek permission of lower ranks, later requesting more formal acceptance from senior officers
4. Do no research
5. Resign from the police service
6. Carry out covert research

Lee asks students to take one of the options specified and to try to convince other group members of the rightness of this course of action. After a period of discussion, each group votes on its preferred courses of action. Then, one group member presents the preferred option and rationale to the class as a whole. What usually emerges from the discussions and presentations, according to Lee, is “an awareness of the competing claims of practicality and ethicality.” In the specific instance reported by Lee, the majority of students thought that the best strategy was to resign from the police force. The fact that the case description closely resembles the experience and dilemma faced by British sociologist Simon Holdaway (1982) should heighten student interest.

**4. Role-Playing Exercise on Student Participation in Class Survey**

Stephanie Teixeira-Poit, Abigail Cameron, and Michael Schulman (2011) provide another well-constructed role-playing exercise that touches on several ethical issues. The exercise involves a case study of a social science professor who is hired by the lawyers of field workers in a suit against a local agribusiness firm (Teixeira-Poit, Cameron, and Schulman, 2011). “To evaluate public opinion about pesticide use, agribusiness firms, and environmental pollution” (p. 256), the professor has students enrolled in his course carry out telephone interviews as part of a class assignment. Among other problems, the professor fails to adequately train his students to do the interviews, is unable to reimburse them, and does not discover, until revealed in the trial, that several students fabricated the survey data.

The authors provide a thorough description of how they use this case study in a three-step exercise with both undergraduate and graduate students. The first step introduces students to relevant sections of the ASA Code of Ethics, namely, guidelines on “delegation and supervision, nonexploitation, reporting on research, and public communications” (p. 247). The second step presents students with the case study (which is appended to the article). The third step involves role-playing followed by structured conversation. During the role-play, students are divided into groups, each of which is given a “role card, which assigns each group to an actor in the case study and presents several questions” (p. 248). For example, one group is asked to play the role of the professor, whom the university is investigating for ethical violations. To prepare for his defense, the group is asked whether they believe the professor and his students violated ethical guidelines.

**5. Using a Mock Institutional Review Board to Teach Research Ethics**

Stephen Sweet (1999) has developed an exercise in which students are asked to serve as an institutional review board in debating the ethics of three hypothetical case studies. The three cases, all of which are described fully in his article, involve (1) a proposal to experimentally manipulate students’ final course grades in order to test the impact of grades on instructor evaluations; (2) a request for college support from a researcher who has been jailed for refusing to surrender her field notes on an “eco-terrorist” group; and (3) a proposal to unearth and analyze data collected during the Holocaust on the effects of exposure to extreme cold. After reading the ASA *Code of Ethics* and a chapter on ethics from a methods textbook, students are provided with a handout of the three projects and asked to act as a campus IRB. See the article for details about the structure of the class’s deliberations and the ethical issues raised by each case.

**6. Politics of Science and Climate Change**

There is no better example of the politics of science than the topic of climate change. There also is a burgeoning literature on both the politics of science generally and the politics of climate change specifically. The March 2015 issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, which focuses on science and politics, is a rich source of lecture material. The introductory article by Elizabeth Suhay and James Druckman (2015) reinforces the text’s discussion of the intersection of values and science, pointing out how individual values influence the scientific agenda, may corrupt the scientific method, and shape the interpretation of scientific information and its application.

In the same issue, Joshua Blank and Daron Shaw (2015) examines the impact of ideology and religion on attitudes toward the use of scientific research to address several public issues, including embryonic stem cell research, global warming, and gay adoption. They found that “the public generally defers to scientific enterprise on a range of public policy issues” (p. 31). On the other hand, Republicans, conservatives, religiously observant individuals, and the less educated are less likely to defer to science than their counterparts, although these patterns vary somewhat according to the policy issue.

Another article by Toby Bolsen, James Druckman, and Fay Lomax Cook (2015) reports the result of a survey of citizens’, scientists’, and policy advisors’ beliefs about global warming. They found that 89 percent of scientists who publish energy-related research, 71 percent of policy advisors on energy issues, and 64 percent of the public believe that global warming is happening. Somewhat lower percentages of these three groups attribute global warming to human actions. Also, as expected, political ideology affects the beliefs of all three groups, with conservatives less likely than liberals to believe that global warming is happening.

**7. Re-Analysis of the Regnerus Data**

In Chapter 3, we cite, but do not discuss, an article by Simon Cheng and Brian Powell (2015) that re-assessed the findings of the Regnerus study. Among other problems, Cheng and Powell show numerous errors and inconsistencies in the categorization of same-sex households, which, we point out in Chapter 3, was a major issue in critiques of Regnerus’s research. When Cheng and Powell correct for the mismeasurement of same-sex families and other errors in the data, they find “minimal differences” in the outcomes for young adults raised by same-sex versus opposite-sex parents.

Instructors could discuss this article from many perspectives. It is another example of how science has the capacity to correct itself. The article clearly lays out seven steps taken to reanalyze the data, and so it also might be used to illustrate and emphasize the importance of decision-making at every step in the research process.

**8. Examples of Research Misconduct**

One area of research ethics not discussed in the textbook, which might be presented in class or readings, is *research misconduct*. Federal policy defines research misconduct as “fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results” (Steneck, 2007:20). *Fabrication* consists of making up data and reporting them. The most common form of *falsification* is manipulating data so that recorded results do not accurately represent actual findings. *Plagiarism* is appropriating another person’s ideas, results, or words without giving proper credit.

Although the extent to which research misconduct occurs is unknown, there are several notorious examples of data falsification and fabrication in the annals of science. Two recent examples of data fabrication in the social sciences that received much attention are Karen Ruggiero’s articles that appeared in two major social psychology journals and Michael LaCour’s co-authored article in the prestigious journal *Science* in December 2014. All of these articles were retracted when it was discovered that the data were fabricated. Singleton and Straits (2018:49-50) discuss the Ruggiero case, pointing out the gravity of scientific fraud and its far-reaching impact as well as measures that may be taken to reduce the likelihood of scientific misconduct. Several articles describe the LaCour case in detail: for example, Aschwanden and Koerth-Baker (2016), Bartlett (2015), and Konnikova (2015). Also see the technical report uncovering irregularities in the LaCour data (Broockman, Kalla, and Aronow, 2015).
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**Exercises**

**1. Evaluating Research Ethics of Case Studies**

Some of the above studies that are recommended as lecture material or for class demonstrations could be used as take-home exercises. For example, instructors could copy and hand out the case study from the Teixeira-Polt et al. (2011) role-playing exercise (the ASA permits, without charge, the copying of such materials for classroom use). Or, at most colleges and universities, students will have access through the library’s electronic databases to online copies of the articles by Rosenhan (1973) and Malamuth et al. (1980). Students could be asked to read the studies and explain how the researchers may have violated ethical guidelines. To provide direction for the analysis beyond students’ reading of Chapter 3, instructors could ask students to read specific ASA or other ethical codes that are relevant to the studies.

**2. Role-Playing in an ORI Online Video**

The U.S. Office of Research Integrity and Office for Human Research Protections has created an excellent video, [*The Research Clinic*](http://ori.hhs.gov/TheResearchClinic), which educates viewers “on the importance of appropriately protecting research subjects and avoiding research misconduct.” After an introduction to the scenario, viewers are given the opportunity to play one of four characters: a principal investigator, a clinical research coordinator, a research assistant, or an IRB chair. Each character faces a series of ethical dilemmas for which the role-player must make a decision-making choice. If the video is assigned as an exercise, students could be asked to play one or more specific roles and to identify the ethical dilemmas and choices faced by the character.

**3. Examining the Relationship between Political Views and Scientific Beliefs**

If students have read Chapter 4 (which could be assigned in conjunction with Chapter 3), they could complete an exercise that requires them to generate cross-tabulations of GSS variables. The 2010 GSS contains one question on belief in the dangers of climate change, and the 2012 GSS contains two questions on beliefs in the effects of same-sex parenting. All three questions are strongly related to political ideology and political party. After generating tables to examine the relationships, students could be asked what the data show about the impact of personal ideology on public policy issues and how this relationship might affect the practice of science. Below is a set of instructions for recoding the relevant GSS variables and running the cross-tabulations.

1. To examine the relationship between political views and belief in the dangers of climate change, you can analyze data from the General Social Survey (GSS), introduced in Chapter 2 (see Box 2.1). GSS data may be accessed and analyzed by visiting a website maintained by the University of California at Berkeley: http://sda.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/hsda?harcsda+gss12. Go to this website and conduct the following analyses.

Opposite “Row:” enter TEMPGEN1(r:1-3;4-5); opposite “Column:” enter POLVIEWS(r:1-3;4;5-7) followed by a space and PARTYID(r:0-1;2-4;5-6). The variable TEMPGEN1 is belief in the dangers of climate change; 1 = “dangerous” and 2 = “not dangerous.” POLVIEWS is the mnemonic label for the variable political ideology; 1 = “liberal”; 2 = “moderate”; and 3 = “conservative.” PARTYID is the mnemonic label for the variable political party identification; 1 = “Democrat”; 2 = “Independent”; and 3 = “Republican.”

Under “Percentaging,” check “Column”; now check “Summary Statistics” and “Question text.” Finally, click “Run the Table.” The numbers in bold are the percentages in each column. Compare the percentages in the first row of each table. Who is more likely to believe that a rise in the world’s temperature caused by climate change is dangerous?

1. Using the same website and GSS data, you also can examine the relationship between political views and belief in the effects of same-sex parenting. Return (or stay at) the above website. Opposite “Row:” enter SSFCHILD(r:1-2;3;4-5) and SSMCHILD(r:1-2;3;4-5). These mnemonic labels pertain to questions which ask respondents how strongly they agree that “A same sex female couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple” (SSFCHILD) and “A same sex male couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple” (SSMCHILD). For each variable, 1 = “agree”; 2 = “neutral”; and 3 = “disagree.”

Now, opposite “Column:” enter POLVIEWS(r:1-3;4;5-7) followed by a space and PARTYID(r:0-1;2-4;5-6). (See part [a] above for a description of these variables.)

Under “Percentaging,” check “Column”; now check “Summary Statistics” and “Question text.” Finally, click “Run the Table.” The numbers in bold are the percentages in each column. Compare the percentages in the first row of each table. Who is more likely to agree that a same-sex couple can bring up a child as well as an opposite-sex couple?

**Web Resources**

**Ethical Codes and Regulations**

Box 3.3 in the textbook provides links to several resources on ethics, including the Belmont Report, Code of Federal Regulations (“Common Rule”), professional codes of several organizations, and the NIH free online tutorial on the rights and welfare of research participants.

[**Informed Consent Checklist**](http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/consentckls.html)

This checklist gleaned from the DHHS Code of Federal Regulations outlines the essential elements and documentation necessary to acquire informed consent.

[**Certificates of Confidentiality Kiosk**](http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/index.htm)

This site provides information about Certificates of Confidentiality issued by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to prevent the forced disclosure of confidential research information. The Certificates allow the investigator to refuse to disclose identifying information on research participants in any legal proceedings. They may be granted for studies collecting sensitive information (e.g., drug use or other illegal activities) that, if disclosed, could have adverse consequences for participants such as by damaging their reputation or employability.

[**The Research Clinic**](https://learninglink.oup.com/access/content/dixon-singleton-straits-3e-student-resources/dixon-singleton-straits-3e-chapter-3-2-video?previousFilter=tag_chapter-videos)

The U.S. Office of Research Integrity and Office for Human Research Protections has created an excellent video, *The Research Clinic*, which educates viewers “on the importance of appropriately protecting research subjects and avoiding research misconduct.” After an introduction to the scenario, viewers are given the opportunity to play one of four characters: a principal investigator, a clinical research coordinator, a research assistant, and IRB chair. Each character faces a series of ethical dilemmas for which the role-player must make a decision-making choice.

[**Research Subject’s Bill of Rights**](https://www.vumc.org/irb/research-subjects-bill-rights)

Several websites such as this one at Vanderbilt University provide a list of the rights of research participants. The list is valuable for anyone who is asked to participate in a research study and, for the researcher, provides a perspective on ethics from the perspective of the participant.

**Answers to Textbook Review Questions**

1. How does an analysis of costs and benefits apply to the ethical conduct of social research? What considerations are involved in conducting a cost-benefit analysis?

Researchers are expected to weigh the costs and benefits of their research because they have an ethical obligation to protect participants from harm, and it would be unethical to conduct research in which the potential costs or risk of harm to participants is unreasonably high relative to the potential benefits. The first consideration is the level of risk to research participants: Greater precautions must be taken if a study involves more than “minimal risk.” The second consideration, which applies to studies that involve some risk, is that the risks must be reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.

1. What are the basic ingredients of informed consent? How did Milgram violate this principle in his research on obedience to authority?

Most importantly, an informed consent agreement must make it clear to research participants that their participation is voluntary and provide them with enough information about foreseeable risks or discomforts so that they can make an informed decision about whether to participate. Milgram violated this principle by not telling participants that they would be placed in a potentially harmful, highly stressful situation and that they could discontinue their participation at any time.

1. Briefly describe the arguments for and against the use of deception in social research. What are the conditions for its use?

Researchers use deception because they believe that without it research participants would not behave naturally and research results would be meaningless. Opponents of deception believe it is immoral to lie, deception violates informed consent, and its use makes participants suspicious and thereby does not accomplish the scientific objectives that it is purported to accomplish. Professional ethical codes generally require two conditions that must be met for the use of deception: (1) Participants should not be deceived when there is substantial risk of harm or stress; (2) All participants must be debriefed, or carefully informed about the nature of the deception, immediately following their participation in the study.

1. How is research participants’ right to privacy typically secured in (a) surveys and (b) field research?

The right to privacy typically is secured in (a) surveys by promising anonymity, which is provided by having respondents fill out unmarked questionnaires, or confidentiality, which is provided by removing identifiers from the data, not disclosing individual identities in research reports, and not divulging individual information without the respondent’s permission. This right is protected in (b) field research by altering reports of field studies so as to prevent recognition (e.g., by using pseudonyms) and by asking the research participants themselves if the material is objectionable.

1. What are Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)? What part do they play in the process of doing ethically responsible research?

IRBs are committees at research institutions that are responsible for reviewing research proposals involving the use of human and animal subjects. Such boards determine if the investigator has thoroughly considered the potential for harm and has provided adequate safeguards for the protection of participants’ rights.

1. Give examples of how values may enter into (a) topic selection, (b) the analysis and interpretation of data, and (c) the dissemination of research findings.

The impact of values in all three phases is illustrated by research on the effects of same-sex parenting on children. (a) This research topic may be chosen because a researcher is an advocate or opponent of gay marriage. (b) Researchers sympathetic to homosexual parenting have tended to ignore or downplay differences between children raised by homosexual parents and those raised by heterosexual parents because of concerns that differences may be construed as deficits. (c) Sociologist Mark Regnerus, who apparently opposes same-sex marriage, co-signed a Supreme Court brief citing his own research that supported defendants of DOMA and Proposition 8.

1. What obligations do social scientists have regarding the use of the knowledge they generate? How is this obligation an example of the intersection of ethics and politics in social research?

According to professional ethical guidelines, social scientists are obligated to be aware of and provide direction to how others use their findings, so that they can insure that their research is properly understood and interpreted. This is an example of the intersection of ethics and politics in that how research results are used depends on the values and politics of the user, and scientists have an ethical obligation to guard against misuse.

**Answers to Selected Textbook Exercises**

1. Discuss the ethical problems raised in the following hypothetical research examples.
2. A criminologist meets a professional fence through an ex-convict he knows. (A *fence* is someone who buys and sells stolen goods.) As part of a study, the researcher convinces the fence to talk about his work—why he sticks with this kind of work, what kind of people he deals with, how he meets them, and so forth. To gain the fence’s cooperation, the researcher promises not to disclose any personal details that would get the fence in trouble. However, when subpoenaed, he agrees to reveal his informant rather than go to jail. Has the researcher violated an ethical principle in agreeing to talk to legal authorities?

The researcher has violated the informant’s right to privacy by revealing information after promising that the information would be confidential.

1. A researcher gains access to a clinic serving AIDS patients by responding to a call for volunteers. While working at the clinic, she makes a record of patients’ names and later approaches them, identifies herself as a social scientist, fully explains the nature of her research, and asks them to participate in her in-depth survey of AIDS victims. Most patients agree, although some react negatively to the request. What aspects of the researcher’s strategy are ethically problematic?

By posing as a volunteer in order to enter an otherwise inaccessible social situation and obtain the names of AIDS patients, this researcher has deliberately misrepresented herself and her intentions. Thus, she has violated the privacy of the patients by gaining contact with and information about them (i.e., their names and the fact that they’re AIDS patients) without their permission.

1. Ethical issues arise when the pursuit of a research question or application of research procedures conflicts with general ethical principles. In a fascinating account in *The Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* (39 [2010]:554–68), Arlene Stein (2010) reflects on ethical dilemmas she faced and ethical questions that were raised by community reaction to her published study of a small town in Oregon. The article shows how a researcher’s ethics may be questioned in spite of her best intentions to conduct research ethically. Read Stein’s article and address the following questions:
2. What ethical dilemma did Stein confront in writing about the townspeople?

Stein promised her informants confidentiality, which she would provide by giving them a pseudonym and changing the name of the town. The use of pseudonyms, however, was not enough to ensure confidentiality, which created an ethical dilemma. On the one hand, confidentiality would be compromised unless she made major changes in the descriptions of individuals and the town; on the other hand, the more she “changed identifying characteristics, the less compelling” her story would be (p. 557).

1. Why did Stein’s use of pseudonyms fail to protect the privacy of the people she interviewed?

Pseudonyms failed to protect privacy because the details that Stein used to describe certain individuals revealed not only who they were but also personal information that they did not want to become known to others.

1. How did she deceive her informants, and do you think this deception was justified?

Stein may have deceived her informants by not telling them “how they would be portrayed” (p. 563), her motivations for doing the research, and that, as a lesbian, she “had a personal stake in the conflict” she was writing about (p. 565). None of these omissions seems necessary to secure her informants’ informed consent. In the end, perhaps the most serious ethical issue is that Stein deceived her informants by not protecting the “anonymity” that she promised to keep.