



from
 Bernard, ed.
 Handbook of Field Methods in Cultural Anthro
 1994

Five

Ethics

Introduction

Considerations of ethics are often raised after some incident has occurred or when an anthropologist feels discomfort about the conduct or progress of fieldwork. The anthropologist's methods may be questioned or his or her position in the social group may be challenged. Access to resource persons may have changed dramatically, or even been denied. Research goals may appear suddenly unattainable and, confused or desperate, the anthropologist may wonder what has gone wrong and why.

When the anthropological researcher and persons studied respect and trust one another, there are positive feelings and outcomes on both sides. However, if an anthropologist has had little or poor training for the field, it will be difficult for him or her to resolve the everyday dilemmas that are part of the practice of the discipline. For example, the anthropologist may not have been well prepared as to the social and political environments of the people to be studied. Or the anthropologist may receive funding from a private or public foundation without having fully considered the conflicting demands and responsibilities between the funder and the people studied. During the research, when the field situation changes and the anthropologist's position becomes ambiguous, the art of negotiating and repositioning oneself resolves to ethical principles and choices.

Matters of ethics are an ordinary, not extraordinary, part of anthropological practice. However, there have been some celebrated cases of alleged ethical misconduct involving major political events of the day. These occurred in Latin America in 1960s, in Vietnam in the 1960s and 1970s, and in the People's Republic of China in the 1980s. So, ethics and professional responsibilities have been

sensitive and controversial topics. Moreover, because ethical conduct may be perceived as overlapping with morality or personal principles, anthropologists, like other human beings, may be reluctant to talk about it for fear of "having done something wrong." Sometimes, just raising the issue of ethics in fieldwork causes a defensive reaction. The person being queried feels that he or she is being accused of wrongdoing rather than just being asked whether ethics have been considered in the fieldwork plan. In this chapter on ethics and methods in anthropological research, I want to focus on how to make ethical considerations an integral part of the ordinary, day-to-day practice of our craft.

History of Ethics in Anthropology

The history of ethical discourse in cultural anthropology intersects with national and international politics and the changing contexts and paradigms of fieldwork. Various incidents have precipitated crises that have forced anthropologists to hold a mirror up to ourselves and to be reflective about the consequences of our actions. Until recently, historical concern with matters of ethics has been more reactive than proactive, more defensive maneuvering than an affirmative tackling of ethical issues. However, significant changes have taken place since 1994, and I shall try to balance the broad historical picture of crises about ethics and anthropology with recent developments in the profession.

The first formal statement on ethics was developed by applied anthropologists in 1949, after discussions that began in the immediate post-World War II era. The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) Committee was chaired by Margaret Mead, and saw its role as creating a document for general use by applied anthropologists. Since that time, the SfAA has amended its guidelines twice, in 1963 and 1983 (see, Statement on Ethics of the Society for Applied Anthropology 1963; and Proposed Statement on Professional and Ethical Responsibilities 1983). Nevertheless, fundamental issues of research—such as the relationship between anthropologist and research collaborators, employers, nongovernmental, or voluntary organizations, and the protection of informant confidentiality—are all significantly present in the statement. The American Anthropological Association (AAA) produced its first statement on ethics nearly two decades later, in 1967.

The first ethics "incident" took place in World War I. It involved Franz Boas, one of the most famous American anthropologists, indeed, perhaps the founder and designer of the unique holistic brand of American anthropology. A prolific writer and experienced ethnographer, Boas also had a strong civic sensibility and was a frequent contributor to numerous nonanthropological periodicals. In a letter published in *The Nation*, Boas, widely known as a pacifist, objected to the wartime activities of four anthropologists who had combined intelligence gathering with their research.

By accident incontrovertible proof has come to my hands that at least four men who carry on anthropological work, while employed as government agents, introduced themselves to foreign governments as representatives of scientific institutions in the United States, and assent for the purpose of carrying on scientific research. They have not only shaken the truthfulness of science, but have also done the greatest possible disservice to scientific inquiry. (Boas 1919)

For this letter of protest, Boas was censured formally by the Anthropology Society of Washington and isolated in general by the anthropological establishment for having drawn the general public's attention to the activities of several anthropologists working as government intelligence gatherers. The issue eventually subsided, and Boas's career was not adversely affected, but sensitivities may have persisted for Boas did not resurrect the subject even though the same situation might have arisen during the years of World War II while he was still alive.

Throughout this century, the issue of anthropologists in the employ of government has retained its potency and significance. Indeed, the AAA drafted the first formal statement on ethics in 1967. This was in the wake of the U.S. Department of the Army's Project Camelot, after revelations that counterinsurgency research in Latin America was a major focus of the proposed social science research. The AAA's first statement on ethics makes explicit reference to the avoidance of the use of the name of anthropology, or the title of anthropologist, as a cover for intelligence activities (Statement 1967:sect. II.6).

A more recent example is that of federal funds made available through the Department of Defense's National Security Education Program (NSEP) for training in foreign language and international studies. The NSEP was established through legislation sponsored by Senator David Boren in 1991. The NSEP provides funds for undergraduate study abroad and fellowships for graduate students to strengthen the national capacity in international education in critical world areas (Preliminary Guidelines 1994-95 Pilot Grants Program, National Security Education Program).

Although funding for international studies had been declining and the Department of Defense monies were tempting, the NSEP was criticized by virtually every major area studies association—including the African Studies Association, the Middle East Studies Association, the Latin American Studies Association, and the Asian Studies Association. Further, their members and potential student applicants were cautioned about the risks of the relationship of foreign area studies scholars with military and intelligence-gathering organizations and priorities. The following resolution of the Middle East Studies Association conveys the types of concerns that the area studies associations had:

The Board of Directors of the Middle East Studies Association joins the African Studies Association and the Latin American Studies Association in expressing appreciation to Senator Boren for his leadership in developing the national Security Education Act. We also share their serious concerns about the administration of the

act, in particular its location in the Department of Defense, and the involvement of the CIA on the National Security Education Board. [The MESA Board] deplores the location of responsibility in the U.S. Defense and intelligence community for a major foreign area research, education and training program of students and specialists. This connection can only increase the existing difficulties of gaining foreign governmental permissions to carry out research and to develop overseas instructional programs. It also can create danger for students and scholars by fostering the perception of involvement in military or intelligence activities, and may limit academic freedom. (Partial text of resolution adopted by MESA Board, 1992; the resolution was revised and passed by referendum vote of MESA membership in 1993; published in *Mesa Newsletter* 1994.)

The AAA, while it cautioned its members to negotiate and understand clearly their relationship to their own and host governments, did not take any specific action nor pass any resolution regarding the creation of NSEP. Perhaps the AAA took no direct action in the National Security Education Program because it was mindful of the need for the funding of international research, governmental or not, and aware of the more direct action and interest of the area studies associations. However, the broadly based reaction to the recent Department of Defense's NSEP is a reminder of the seriousness of the issue of the use or appearance of the use of anthropology or any discipline as a cover for intelligence gathering. It demonstrates the continuing relevance of Boas's admonition of 1919 to avoid such ties to defense, military, and intelligence agencies.

The Vietnam War era was the most important turning point for anthropology and other social sciences. It caused us to take matters of professional ethics seriously, to develop a code of conduct, and to provide a mechanism for enforcement. Once again, allegations that anthropologists had engaged in counterintelligence research, this time in Thailand and Southeast Asia, precipitated a crisis in the field. Anthropologist was pitted against anthropologist, just as the entire American society was torn asunder by issues of politics and morality in the Vietnam war. The end result, after heated confrontations in print and in public meetings, was the formation of a Committee on Ethics and the drafting and promulgation of the first code of ethics by the AAA in 1971 (see Statement on Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility 1971). In this code, a strong first principle was enunciated that lasted for a generation: "In research the anthropologist's paramount responsibility is to those he studies. When there is a conflict of interest, these individuals must come first."

Today, even if more than half of anthropologists weren't female, the reference to "he" would be unacceptable, but this language illustrates that much has changed in ethics as well as gender since 1971. Other strong principles reflected the tenor of the times.

(1) that no secret or clandestine research be carried out; that even the appearance of conducting clandestine research hurts the good reputation of anthropology and its

practitioners; (2) that in relations with one's own and host governments anthropologists should not be required to compromise ethics as a condition for the conduct of research; (3) when an anthropologist by his[her] actions jeopardizes peoples studied, colleagues, students or others the Association may inquire into the propriety of these actions and take appropriate measures. (Principles of Professional Responsibility 1971)

Tension Between Applied and Academic Anthropologists

In the decades after the end of the Vietnam War, the immediacy and intensity of these selected core principles faded dramatically as contract or proprietary research for governmental and nongovernmental agencies became more common and tended to neutralize the issue of secret/ clandestine research for governments. This coincided with the post-Vietnam War economic downturn. Many professionally trained anthropologists were unable to secure academic employment, and some turned to professional work in the applied fields. This demographic transformation meant that in 1986, for the first time since the founding of the AAA in 1902, more anthropologists (51%) were employed outside of academia than within it (Fluehr-Lobban 1991a:5).

Throughout the 1980s, practicing anthropologists increased in such numbers so as to constitute something of a lobbying force within the AAA, and some formed a new professional organization, the National Association of Practicing Anthropologists (NAPA). It sought to revise the PPR to make it more accommodating to the interests and needs of professional, nonacademic anthropologists. In particular, the practicing anthropologists were concerned that the "first responsibility of the anthropologist to the people studied could not always be met under the terms of contract research." They attempted unsuccessfully to revise the PPR in 1984, again precipitating charged debates within the profession. They eventually created their own set of ethical guidelines that were more suited to the complexities of contract and proprietary research.

Many academic anthropologists, recalling the heady days in which the PPR was created, were reluctant to see any modification of the principle that the first responsibility in research is to the people studied. I have summarized some of the tensions between academic and applied anthropologists expressed during this time (Fluehr-Lobban 1991b), suggesting that the differences were significant enough to challenge the traditional holism of anthropology itself. Discussions of differences, real and imagined, between academic and practicing anthropologists, continued throughout the 1980s. They were carried out in various forums, including symposia at the annual AAA meetings, several of which I organized and chaired. These debates and discussions evoked the subtitle of my 1991 edited volume on ethics and the profession of anthropology, "dialogue for a new era" (Fluehr-Lobban 1991a).

Some subjective sources of tension between practicing anthropologists and academic anthropologists also surfaced during the 1980s, when jobs for anthropologists were scarce. Academic anthropologists may have not have fully understood or were skeptical about the types of contract-based research with which practicing anthropologists were involved. And applied anthropologists may have experienced some isolation from the traditionally academically oriented discipline as they pioneered new venues for applying and using anthropological research. Some academic anthropologists asserted that their research was "pure," whereas applied research is compromised by the client-researcher relationship. These tensions have eased at present, as the job market has improved somewhat. The present revised code of ethics makes no distinction whatsoever between so-called pure and so-called applied research. Practicing anthropologists have contributed ideas and their perspective to the new code. In the end, research is research, period.

Call for Revision of the PPR, A Code for All of Anthropology

Beyond the tension between academic and practicing anthropologists, other weaknesses in the PPR were revealed. For example, a complex grievance procedure was provided for the AAA Committee on Ethics (COE). The procedure included receiving and screening cases, with the Executive Board being responsible for the final judgment and any action taken. However, not a single anthropologist has been censured since this function of the COE was adopted in 1976. What has happened was that the COE was primarily called on, time after time, to mediate disputes between colleagues over matters of plagiarism, employment, and personal differences. Based on her experience as former member and chair of the AAA COE, Janet Levy concluded that the grievance mechanism should be reviewed and possibly eliminated because of the complex procedures involving multiple levels of review and the slowness and general lack of resolution of intraprofessional disputes (Levy 1994).

In 1994, the AAA decided to reexamine systematically the underlying principles and practice of professional ethics within the discipline. A Commission to Review the AAA Statements on Ethics was formed in 1994 and continued its work through 1997. It was initiated by John Comman, then executive director of AAA, and chaired by James Peacock, then president of AAA, and included AAA members from archaeology and physical anthropology, as well as applied and cultural anthropologists who have traditionally been at the center of ethics discourse. I was a member of this commission.¹

The commission discussed changes in the PPR and reached consensus on a number of fundamental issues. After 2 years, the PPR was revised and a new code of ethics was drafted (see Fluehr-Lobban 1996). The most important procedural

change is that the code shifts from one that has a grievance procedure with ability to sanction individual anthropologists to one that emphasizes ethics education. As mentioned above, over the nearly 25 years that the PPR had been in effect no anthropologist had been censured, so the "teeth" of the professional code had not been applied. Ethics education is preferred so that an ongoing discussion of ethical issues can take place as the profession develops and adapts to changing circumstances for anthropological research.

A major development is that, for the first time, the new code of the AAA speaks to ethical issues we confront in the four-field definition of American anthropology. "Anthropological researchers have primary ethical responsibility to the people, species, and materials they study and to the people with whom they work." This is a modification of the former "first responsibility" of the anthropologist to the people studied, a cornerstone principle of the 1971 PPR. Thus, the anthropologist is now enjoined to do no harm, to respect the well-being of humans and nonhuman primates, and to conserve the archaeological, fossil, and historical record.

Without being explicit, the new code reinforces and may even reinvent the integrative, holistic approach that has been the hallmark of American anthropology. It also reflects a reaction to the proliferation of codes of different anthropological groups. These codes had been developed in response to the realization or complaint that the AAA code didn't address their subgroup's concerns. For example, by 1995, when the new code was drafted, there were codes of professional ethics for the AAA (the PPR), the Society for Applied Anthropology, the NAPA, the Society of Professional Archaeologists, and the Archaeological Institute of America.²

The general admonition in the new code to "do no harm" is a basic principle in many professional codes and is purposefully broad. But in commenting on the draft code, NAPA judged this phrasing to be too simplistic. Practicing anthropologists, they argue, are involved in many types of research, frequently affecting individuals and groups with diverse and sometimes conflicting interests. In such cases of potential conflict, no absolute rule can be observed, but the individual practitioner must make carefully considered ethical choices and be prepared to make clear the assumptions, facts, and issues on which those choices are based (Jordan 1996:18).

The issue of secret or clandestine research, which has evoked such passion in the past, has gradually evolved to concerns over proprietary research, where anthropologists contract their services to an agency for a specified period of time and amount of funding. Clandestine research has been consistently criticized in previous codes and statements on ethics; proprietary research has been an area where applied and practicing anthropologists have urged their colleagues to be aware of possible conflicts between the interests of funders of research and the people studied. Presumably, anthropologists conducting pure research (probably more mythology than fact) were not constrained by their funders in the same ways that anthropologists conducting proprietary research are. The revised code distinguishes

distinctions between pure and applied research—quite simply, research is research, and standards of ethical conduct in research are the same, irrespective of private or public funding. The new code does call for the open and accessible publication of research results within a reasonable period of time, which might be negotiated in advance, in order to ensure that secret research is not sanctioned.

The new code contains specific language regarding informed consent, which means that anthropology has situated itself within the broader scientific and professional community of scholars and scientists in the United States and increasingly in the world. The informed consent language is intended to encompass both the ethical and legal intent of this broad principle. This will be discussed in detail below.

Finally, the new code addresses the issue of advocacy in anthropology and whether this is an ethical responsibility. It was agreed that advocacy is very much a moral choice that may be made by individual anthropologists, but it is not a professional duty. When anthropologists choose advocacy, they should be cautious about the selective use of their data for whatever good cause is being advocated.

An Ethically Conscious Model of Anthropological Research

The foregoing discussion of the history of ethical discourse and concern within anthropology should demonstrate to the relative newcomer to the field that anthropologists and their professional associations take ethics seriously. Ethics should be considered first, not last, in anthropological fieldwork. Thinking about ethics should be a part of every research plan from beginning to end, from initial design, to pursuit of funding, through actual research, to eventual publication of results. There are many regulations that students and researchers become aware of only when conducting research, but a little advance preparation might allow them to make more informed and better decisions. The basic guidelines for the ethical conduct of research in anthropology, or any field, are openness and disclosure. The present draft code of the AAA is clear and unambiguous on this fundamental idea: "In both proposing and carrying out research, anthropologists must be open about the purpose(s), potential impacts, and source(s) of support for research projects with funders, colleagues, persons studied or providing information, and with relevant parties affected by the research" (Draft Code 1995:A.41).

Consideration of Ethics at Every Stage of Research and Publication

Anthropologists, and probably other researchers, like to think that they have complete freedom in the conduct of their research. "Just come up with a good idea

and go and study it," might have been the advice of anthropologist-mentors in past generations. However, the complexities and sensitivities of conducting research in the postcolonial, non-Western world, not to mention studying American populations, make this absolutist position untenable today.

Potential Research Projects

From the initial concept of a research project, an anthropologist should ask himself or herself the following: Can I carry out the project without violating ethical standards or compromising professional standards? If there are questions about this—for example, concerning Native American rights to cultural and material property—can I modify the research to accommodate the legitimate interests of the group to be studied? Is negotiating the terms of research a possibility or, among some groups, a necessity? Have I discussed the ethical issues or questions with other anthropologists and mentors, with members of the ethics committee of my institution, with some representatives of the group I plan to study, if possible? Have I acquainted myself with the existence, guidelines, procedures of tribal, ethnic, or national review boards? If ethical considerations are sufficiently serious, should I consider abandoning the project?

Sources of Funding

In the next phase, the anthropologist should ask the following questions of himself or herself. Have I considered various sources of funding appropriate to the research and their potential regulatory role over the conduct of my research? Have I thought about the conditions that certain funding sources may impose upon my research? Have I answered the question in the affirmative, that I would be willing to disclose the source(s) of my funding to the people/group(s) studied? If the research is being funded by a nongovernmental organization, or if the funding is slated for very specific proprietary research, have I discussed with the funder the degree to which the research results will remain private, or eventually become a part of the public domain? Have I satisfied myself that the research is proprietary and not secret?

Using Data from Research

In the last phase, the anthropologist should think about the following: Have I considered the potential use(s) to which my research will be put? Have I resolved, to my own satisfaction, potential conflicts of interest between the client-funder and the people-culture researched?

The questions raised here are not simple ones, but if you ask and answer them satisfactorily *before* you begin your research, you will save yourself a good deal of

anxiety and discomfort in the field. Such questions and answers might also be the proper doses of prevention that avoid disaster when communication and trust break down because openness and disclosure weren't practiced. Most people, irrespective of cultural difference, operate in good faith when they have the necessary information to make informed choices. If you're open with "informants," you give them the right to say no to your requests for information.

Proprietary and Secret Research

Students and researchers may be confused by the difference between proprietary and secret research. This is an especially sensitive subject for anthropology since it was allegations that secret research had been conducted in Southeast Asia that led to the crisis that produced the first AAA code of ethics.

Proprietary research is normally negotiated between client and researcher for a specific project, length of research, and terms of publication. Proprietary research is normally not "owned" by the researcher, but is research conducted for the client. Often, proprietary research is conducted for nongovernmental organizations, such as the World Bank, or nonprofit groups, such as "Save the Children." Usually, access to the published results of the research is not restricted.

In secret research, openness and disclosure of research intentions, funding, and outcome of research is normally not practiced with the people studied. Further, publication of research results is usually restricted and not available to the general public through usual avenues of distribution. Professional codes of ethics within the AAA, from 1971 to the present revisions, have stood firmly and consistently against anthropologists engaging in secret research of any kind. The present code says: "The researchers must have the intention and expectation to disseminate publicly results of the research within a reasonable period of time" (Draft Revised Code 1995).

Research Review Boards

All universities and colleges are mandated by federal guidelines to have Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) that are charged with the responsibility to review all research proposals that involve the conduct of research with human subjects.³ The guidelines were originally established for research in the biomedical fields, but anthropologists are also bound by these regulations. Some anthropological research may be evaluated as being of minimal risk to research participants, such as the observation of public behavior.

Little anthropological research remains solely in the public domain. It often moves to a personal, closer relationship with human beings. Physical anthropology research may be classified as a type of biomedical research requiring informed

consent. Archaeologists, though they work primarily with material culture, are nonetheless responsible to various "stakeholders," who may be representatives of indigenous peoples, state or national historic commissions, and/or their sponsors, each of whom has a special and sometimes conflicting interest with the other. Ideally in this situation, or a like one for cultural research, the anthropologist can play a constructive role as broker, negotiating and achieving compromise among the various interested parties. There is no subfield of anthropology, nor any part of the practice of anthropology, that is free of ethical responsibility.

There has been some resistance by anthropologists to being called before review boards, thereby having what we may view as our special field methods subjected to scrutiny. Perhaps because our research is comparative and most often conducted outside of the United States, we tend to believe that the rules don't apply to us. A parallel tendency sees anthropological research as unique and therefore not related to ideas or ethical practices that developed outside of our discipline. This view mistakenly adopts an exceptionalist view of anthropological research as being fundamentally different from other kinds of research. Again, research is research, and the rights of research participants don't vary whether they're studied by psychologists, cardiologists, or anthropologists. Nor do the responsibilities of the researchers vary substantially. Indeed, today much anthropological research is conducted in an interdisciplinary environment where ethical standards must be uniform.

Review boards themselves vary considerably. Some may take a strict or narrow interpretation of informed consent, requiring explanations of why anthropological research does not lend itself to the use of consent forms. IRBs may be sensitive or insensitive to issues in cross-cultural research, depending on the experiences of board members. Anthropologists would do well to consult with their IRB and perhaps open a dialogue with members about the nature and extent of federal and institutional regulation of their proposed research; an initial informal inquiry might make the formal request go more smoothly. The researcher might inquire how the research proposal would best address the expected standards of research practice while bringing up some of the particular cultural or linguistic issues that are a usual part of anthropological research.

A large amount of anthropological research today is carried out in the United States, and federal guidelines apply because the anthropologists are recipients of federal funding. These guidelines have been enacted since the publication of the last general *Handbook of Research Method in Cultural Anthropology* (Naroll and Cohen 1973). Researchers from outside the United States should acquaint themselves with comparable national or institutional review boards.

My own experience as a member and later chair of my home institution's Committee on Research with Human Participants is that review boards are user-friendly places that act more in an advisory capacity than as "courts of law," where

researchers are given a thumbs up or down approval or rejection. Usually, in my experience, a research design that is flawed or insufficiently addresses issues of ethics can be discussed, negotiated, redesigned, improved, and eventually approved. The dialogue is what is important, all part of taking a proactive approach to ethics, not one based on the fear of alleged misconduct or wrongdoing. Don't be shy or intimidated about educating members of IRBs, or their equivalents, about the nature of anthropological research and the methods we use, and do negotiate issues or areas of possible disagreement with committee members.

Low-Risk, Unobtrusive Research

Much of anthropological or social scientific research may appear to be of low or minimal risk, with insignificant or no potential harm to participants. As such, federal regulations and institutional review may be exempt in cases of low or nil risk to those studied. The President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medical, Biomedical and Behavioral Research (1980-83) adopted the view that consent need not be obtained for research characterized by the following conditions:

1. the observation of behavior on public places where questions of privacy do not exist;
2. review of publicly available information, including personal identity information;
3. research using low-risk methods, such as questionnaires, interviews, or tests in which agreement to participate effectively constitutes consent.

The first two might be considered unobtrusive research, where no observable risk to those studied can be shown. In the latter case, however, anthropologists should not exempt themselves from practicing full disclosure simply because they are using low-risk methods, such as using questionnaires or interviews. In administering tests, the potentially coercive relationship between test-giver and test-taker should be recognized as one where a power differential exists. Using students to fill out questionnaires within the classroom setting, for example, has a coercive dimension, and anthropologists should instead look for venues for research outside of the classroom.

Informed Consent

One of the areas where there may be disagreement about research methods and ethics is the subject of informed consent. This has become a virtual canon of ethics and research in all fields, whether the research is biomedical, behavioral, or social scientific (see Fluehr-Lobban 1994). The legal doctrine of informed consent grew out of the post-World War II world that was shaken to its moral and ethical core,

not only by the revelation of Nazi atrocities, but by the collaboration of science with immoral and unethical practices. Originally developed for medical research, informed consent has expanded to include research with humans across the scientific-social scientific spectrum, with psychology having provided the historic bridge between the two. In 1995, the principle of informed consent was added to the new code of ethics of the American Anthropological Association.

Few anthropologists know this history or appreciate its relevance to their own research. Some may view informed consent in a rather mechanistic fashion because, frankly, in medical research, much of it has devolved to signing a form for legal purposes. This is unfortunate, because the genesis of informed consent and its guiding spirit is that of openness and disclosure in research practice. By extension, in social science research, using the spirit of informed consent means that the researcher actually discusses the methods and likely research outcome with the participant, thus the studier and the studied develop an open relationship. Ideally, informed consent opens up a two-way channel of communication that, once opened, allows for a continuous flow of information and ideas. This is the spirit of informed consent, rather than the mechanistic application of a form designed more to protect the researcher than the research participant.

In an article in *Human Organization*, I argued for the acceptance of the spirit of informed consent, combined with behavior that is appropriate to our methods and our traditionally close relationship with the peoples we research (Fluehr-Lobban 1994). For purposes of federal regulation and enforcement, informed consent has been defined as "the knowing consent of an individual, or a legally authorized representative, able to exercise free power of choice without undue inducement or any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, or other form of constraint or coercion" (Rules and Regulations, *Federal Register* 1994).

For federally regulated agencies that sponsor research, the documentation of informed consent must be demonstrated in one of the following ways: (1) written consent document, to be signed by the subject or authorized agent; (2) a "short form" summary document ensuring that informed consent requirements have been met; (3) modification of 1 and 2, where minimal risk is demonstrated or where obtaining informed consent would invalidate the objectives of research. In the latter case, the responsibility of the external review committee or IRB increases proportionately to the diminished informed consent requirement.

The present revised code of the AAA makes significant reference to informed consent for the first time. It is worth excerpting here:

Anthropological researchers must obtain in advance the informed consent of persons being studied, providing information, owning or controlling access to material being studied or otherwise identified as having interests which might be impacted by the research. It is understood that the degree and breadth of informed consent will depend upon the nature of the project. . . . Further it is understood that the informed consent

process may be dynamic. . . . Informed consent does not necessarily imply or require a particular written or signed form. It is the quality of the consent, not the format, that is relevant (Draft Code 1995:B.3).

Much anthropological research has escaped federal regulation because it is small scale (in other words, few anthropologists have been funded by the National Science Foundation or National Institute of Health). Also, as noted, many anthropologists viewed their own research as relatively benign, posing little risk to research informants, and, perhaps, they believed they could protect their subjects from harm. However, much contemporary anthropological research is occurring in complex areas of applied social science and in public sector, community-based projects with protected Americans. The contemporary reality is that the anthropological researcher is often a part of a multidisciplinary team working in U.S. alcohol and drug abuse research projects, for example, or in development-related projects overseas.

Questions of the universality of informed consent can be posed at this point. In fact, many who oppose the application of informed consent in anthropology bring up its cultural and legal history in the United States. European social anthropologists may be reluctant to apply informed consent as an ethical or legal concept because of its perceived specific connection to the United States. However, the intent of informed consent, without the mechanistic use of forms and legalistic implications of its application, is becoming more universally recognized as a significant ethical principle that transcends culture and language.

Working with this historical tie to U.S. postwar history, we may legitimately ask whether non-American research participants are entitled to the same protections afforded by informed consent as are Americans. I hope that the answer would be that humans, irrespective of culture or nation, are entitled to the same rights and protections, but I fear that there may be, in practice, a double standard.

Does the concept of informed consent translate across languages and cultures? Arguments against using informed consent in anthropology have drawn on the cultural relativist theme. J. A. Barnes (1979) argued that informed consent is a U.S. or Western concept that cannot be fully explained in cross-cultural research. Honesty about one's research methods, goals, and sources of funding, however, is not a Western concept. Although cultures vary in their modes of communication, no culture endorses dishonesty or deception. Experienced anthropological researchers know of the benefits of an open, mutual relationship with research participants. Some even think in terms of a "covenantal" relationship that anthropologists have with their research collaborators (Wax 1995).

I will draw on my own 6 years of anthropological research, spanning 25 years and three different African countries, to inform this discussion. I began my doctoral research when the first code of anthropological ethics was promulgated, and those heated debates among anthropologists over the politics of research were my training ground. In the Sudan in 1970, people were suspicious as to why two American

researchers had come all that way to learn Arabic and study their culture. The CIA was mentioned as the agent behind us, rather than an American university fellowship, and my husband (a fellow anthropologist) and I felt awkward and untrusted. The only antidote to this public perception was honesty, openness, and full disclosure of who we were and what we intended to do during our 18 months in the country.

We waited six months for our visas in the United States and three more months for permission by the National Research Board to conduct research. The waiting, patience, and openness were beneficial as we made friends with the members of the research board, learned basic colloquial Arabic, and word spread that we were actually decent, honorable Americans, not CIA agents.

During subsequent research in the Sudan (1979-80), in Egypt (1982-84), in and Tunisia (1990), we developed greater familiarity with the language, with research participants, and cultural sensibilities about research and privacy issues. I came to understand that being open about research is a way to keep open the lines of communication throughout the course of research, to allow negotiation of terms of research as it progresses through its various stages. Informed consent doesn't translate literally and directly into Arabic, or I suspect, many other languages. But making honest attempts to talk about the nature, course, and research funding and allowing a relationship to unfold that may even permit a participant's withdrawal from research is more ethical and probably results in better research. In my fieldwork, once people understood the nature of my inquiry into some, admittedly, sensitive family law cases and issues, they asked that certain information not be used or published. Sometimes they withheld information, understanding that certain individuals or families might be compromised by public knowledge of their personal conflicts.

In retrospect, this selected review of my fieldwork experiences is not without its own dose of self-criticism. I am acutely aware that higher-class families were more sensitive about protecting their respectability and privacy than were lower-class, less well-educated families, and I may have exerted a double standard in this respect. In another vein, I became increasingly cognizant of highly sensitive research subject matter, such as the rise of Islamist movements in Egypt, Sudan, and Tunisia during later stages of my research career. I struggled with the ethical dilemma of being open with national research boards, disguising my interest in fundamentalist Islam with other research objectives, or resolving the dilemma by not conducting research. In the end, I decided not to carry out the research on the subject and to postpone or altogether avoid research in the country I had chosen.

For my generation of anthropologists trained in the 1960s and 1970s, and those who preceded awareness of the importance of theoretical and practical ethics, the training we received in graduate school was inadequate to carry out informed and balanced ethical decision making. With the shift from an adjudicative code to an educational one, the hope is that professional ethics and active discussion of ethical

dilemmas will become an integral part of undergraduate and graduate education in anthropology.

Informed Consent Without Forms: Acknowledging the Risk of Paternalism

Almost invariably, when the subject of informed consent is brought up with anthropologists, the first objection they raise is the use of a consent form. However, informed consent does not require forms. Indeed, much of anthropological research, utilizing methods of participant observation, would mitigate against using forms. However, researchers should be aware that they may be required by their funding agency or home institution to use informed consent forms. Most, if not all, medical-biological research that interfaces with physical or cultural anthropology requires informed consent forms. I fear that informed consent, when mechanically applied using a form or some verbal formula, becomes more of a protection for the researcher than the researched. Informed consent obtained in this way is unilateral rather than bilateral and protects the researcher against charges from participants that they did not understand fully the intent or outcome of research.

In a research relationship with non-Western, often relatively powerless participants, the Western researcher may feel awkward asking for a signature on a consent form. The person being studied may not be literate or the official appearance of the form may be intimidating. A psychologist conducting cross-cultural research with Guatemalan women (Lykes 1989) concluded that the informed consent form had become a barrier between researcher and researched. The researcher regarded resistance to signing the form as a positive demonstration of assertion of control over the research environment. Our "subjects" are not necessarily passive. The value of conducting research in an open, collaborative manner is that informed consent becomes a natural part of the development of the research project and relationship with those you study. You can obtain informed consent without using forms by raising relevant issues that inform and thereby empower the participant.

It is true that anthropological research can be highly personal, with intimate relations of confidence and trust developing as a result of long-term residence with people; it is also true that research is often conducted in the local language, which conveys a greater intimacy than would occur in translation. That intimacy is a powerful instrument that you must use with care so as not to violate the trust established, nor abuse the confidence that has been given to you.

An unconscious or unspoken paternalism may have kept some of these issues from being fully aired in anthropological discourse. This is what used to be called the "My Tribe" syndrome, where anthropologists might have felt that they did what was best for "their" people. In social or cultural anthropology, under historical

conditions of actual colonialism or perceived colonial-like agencies like the American Bureau of Indian Affairs, paternalism was not uncommon and may have characterized human relations between anthropologist and subject (Asad 1973:16).

The era of colonialism has passed, and indigenous peoples of America, indeed the postcolonial world, are actively restructuring their relationships with states and all manner of external institutions that impact their lives, including the activities of researchers. Most U.S. and Canadian Tribal Councils have autonomous research review boards to which anthropologists and other researchers must apply before receiving approval to carry out their projects. Typically, through the process of requesting permission to conduct research, the terms and conditions of the research plan are negotiated, in effect an official airing of the proposal where the required openness and disclosure amount to informed consent.

Controversy over ethical and legal issues arising from the Human Genome Diversity Project has centered on the potential abuse of relationships between powerful Western scientific bodies and relatively powerless indigenous populations about who owns and controls human genetic materials, including cell lines that can be developed from DNA samples taken by researchers. I suspect that the proper communication amounting to informed consent was lacking in the celebrated case where "theft" or appropriation of human genetic material was alleged. The obvious solution is to engage in an open dialogue of the risks and benefits of the proposed research with the research participants themselves and, ideally, to engage with them as collaborators. This is a clear and positive trend in anthropological research, which is increasingly recognized as constituting not only better ethics in research, but as producing better research results.

Much of the history of informed consent has been linked to protecting the rights of individuals, reflective of the norms of American life. However, anthropologists and non-Western scholars have been the leading spokespersons asserting the difference between Western and other cultures in the matter of the greater value placed on collective rights in non-Western societies. This should not present any insurmountable obstacle to obtaining informed consent, for negotiations with representative and responsible agents of tribal and ethnic groups can be combined with individual consent. In some cases, where large community-based studies are proposed and negotiated, public meetings of potential participants are scheduled, where opposing viewpoints can be openly expressed. These can and should be regularized as an ongoing part of the course of research, ensuring active community involvement and monitoring. Some potential researchers may feel uncomfortable with the degree of openness that is being discussed here, but we must acknowledge that retreating from openness may result in some form of deception. This is why we must carefully consider the ethical implications of every phase of our research project.

The purposes of this rather lengthy discussion of informed consent are twofold. First, the application of the ethical and legal principle of informed consent has been

a recent development, relatively late for the biomedical, physical dimensions of anthropological research, and in conformity with recent developments in sociocultural research. Therefore, the utility of informed consent may need some explanation and justification. Second, the spirit of informed consent has a certain potency as a summary concept for research, irrespective of discipline or sub-discipline. Informed consent, in its fullest interpretation, means openness and disclosure with participants, and models of research that are collaborative, rather than hierarchical and relatively nonparticipatory. This may be reflected in a detectable change in terminology of social research, with fewer references to "informants" and "subjects" and more reference to "collaborators" and "participants." When the spirit of informed consent is implemented, it results in better researchers and better research.

Concluding Remarks

The Preamble to the revised AAA code of ethics states that the anthropological researcher, scholar, or teacher is a member of many different communities, each with its own set of contextual obligations, for example, as a member of a family, a community, a public or private employee, and a host of other roles and statuses (see Appendix to this chapter [p. 195]). Anthropological research can place the researcher/scholar in complex situations, where competing but legitimate ethical claims can arise.

The informed and ethically conscious researcher will recognize the multiple layers of responsibility that can obtain in research. These might include ethical responsibility to the people studied in their complex relations with one another and to their state and other communities and institutions that impact their lives; responsibility to those into whose confidence you were taken; responsibility to the truth, to science, and to one's discipline; and responsibility to the client or funder of research.

With these complexities in mind, the AAA Commission, charged with reviewing the statements on ethics, modified the original code. In the Principles of Professional Responsibilities, the anthropologist's "first responsibility" was to the "people studied." The modified version said, "Anthropological researchers have primary ethical obligations to the people, species, and materials they study and to the people with whom they work" (Final Draft, Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association, 1997). In the context of this assessment, the anthropologist must be guided by the following general ethical principles of conduct:

1. To do no harm or wrong, understanding that the development of knowledge can lead to change which may be positive or negative for some people. Weighing the kinds, degrees, duration, and probability of goods to be gained and harms to be avoided is the task of the informed and ethically conscious researcher.

2. Avoiding deception or knowing misrepresentation of one's research goals, methods, or funding with the persons/communities studied is a *sine qua non* of social research. This extends, naturally, to any fabrication of evidence, falsification of data, or plagiarism in the processing and publication of the results of research.
3. Acting impartially, such that all persons affected by our research are treated in the same manner, insofar as this is possible under the conditions of research. (Final Report of the Commission, AAA Draft Code of Ethics, *Anthropology Newsletter* 1996)

These are general principles that should guide all research, including the social research of cultural anthropologists. Studying these principles and discussing their application in various research settings should be part of undergraduate and graduate education and training in anthropology; reference to them should be a part of every research proposal. Developing awareness of the fundamental importance of ethics as a key component of professionalism and as a necessary adjunct to science and research is an essential task of the next generation of anthropologists. Ethics education, and more importantly, constructive and engaged dialogue about the ethics of social research, should be more central to our work and our profession than it is at the moment.

The dialogue about ethics and research extends to the international arena. In 1996, I was invited to the 4th Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists in Barcelona to discuss the recent changes in the AAA code of ethics and to consider international perspectives in anthropology and ethics. An international Ethics Network was created to facilitate discussion of ethics and anthropology across national borders at the suggestion of Peter Pels of the University of Amsterdam. This meeting acknowledged the major changes that have taken place worldwide in the practice of anthropology and in the conduct of anthropological research.

Anthropologists, irrespective of national origin or country of research, face common challenges and similar responsibilities when they conduct research in our ever-shrinking global context. Whether as academic researchers, development workers in governmental or nongovernmental agencies, or one of a myriad of new applications of anthropology, researchers need to consider their ethical choices and professional responsibilities in ever more complex social environments. AIDS-related studies in cross-cultural research, participation in development projects, and the study of ethnic minorities in nation-states are just a few examples of contemporary research projects that raise ethical dilemmas and require dialogue—possibly, negotiation of the terms and conditions of research within funding agencies and the nation-states where the research is to be carried out. Already, a study of how anthropologists make ethical decisions in research is being carried out by George Ulrich of the University of Copenhagen. An international discussion of cases and comparison of research experiences would be a welcome addition to broadening the discourse about ethics in anthropology.

NOTES

1. Other members of the Commission to Review the AAA Statements on Ethics included James Peacock, Barbara Frankel, Janet Levy, Murray Wax, and Kathleen Gibson.
2. All of these codes, through the 1990 AAA revision, are reprinted in my edited volume, *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era* (1991). The most recent Code of Ethics is reprinted here as an Appendix by permission of the American Anthropological Association. Not for further reproduction.
3. Historically, research participants have been referred to as "subjects" in biomedical and psychological research. Anthropologists-sociologists have used the term "informants." However, "participants" or "collaborators" is gradually replacing "subjects" and "informants" as more egalitarian ideals of the relationship between researcher and researched are evolving.

REFERENCES

- Asad, Talal, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Barnes, J. A. 1979. *Who Should Know What: Social Science, Privacy and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boas, Franz. 1919. Correspondence: Scientists as Spies. *The Nation* 109:279.
- Final Report of the Commission to Review the AAA Statements on Ethics; Draft AAA Code of Ethics. 1996. *Anthropology Newsletter* (April):13-16.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 1991a. Professional Ethics and Anthropology: Tensions Between Its Academic and Applied Branches. *Business and Professional Ethics* 10(4):57-68.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn, ed. 1991b. *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 1994. Informed Consent in Anthropological Research: We Are Not Exempt. *Human Organization* 53(1):1-9.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 1996. Developing the New Code of Ethics. *Anthropology Newsletter* (April):17-18.
- Jordan, Ann. 1996. Review of the AAA Code of Ethics. *Anthropology Newsletter* (April):17-18.
- Levy, Janet. 1994. Report to the American Anthropological Association. *Anthropology Newsletter* (February):1, 5.
- Lykes, M. Brinton. 1989. Dialogue with Guatemalan Indian Women: Critical Perspectives on Constructing Collaborative Research. In *Representations: Social Constructions of Gender*. Rhoda K. Unger, ed. Pp. 167-185. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing.
- MESA Newsletter* 16:1, May 1994. Tucson: University of Arizona.
- Naroll, Raoul, and Ronald Cohen, eds. 1973. *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Proposed Statement on Professional and Ethical Responsibilities. 1983. *Human Organization* 42:367.
- Protection of Human Subjects. 1990. Part 1028. *Code of Federal Regulations*. Ch. 11 (1-1-90) ed. p. 1028.1. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rules and Regulations. May 19, 1994. *Federal Register* 59(96):26116-26119.
- Statement on Ethics of the Society for Applied Anthropology. 1963. *Human Organization* 23:237.
- Statement on Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility. Adopted by the Council of the American Anthropological Association, May 1971 (as amended through November 1976).
- Statement on Problems of Anthropological Research and Ethics, Adopted by the Council of the American Anthropological Association. 1967. Reprinted in *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era*, Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, ed. Pp. 243-246. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wax, Murray. 1995. Informed Consent in Applied Research: A Comment. *Human Organization* 54(3):330-331.

WORKS RELEVANT TO ETHICS AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- AAA Newsletter*, monthly column, Ethical Dilemmas (this is a good way to keep current with ethical discourse in the United States).
- Appell, G. N. 1978. *Ethical Dilemmas in Anthropological Inquiry: A Case Book*. Waltham, MA: Crossroads Press.
- Beauchamp, Tom L., and Terry P. Pinkard, eds. 1983. *Ethics and Public Policy: An Introduction to Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bulmer, Martin, ed. 1982. *Social Research Ethics*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Cassell, Joan, and Sue-Ellen Jacobs, eds. 1987. *Handbook on Ethical Issues in Anthropology*. Special publication, No. 23. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Chambers, Erve. 1980. Fieldwork and the Law. *Social Problems* 27:330-341.
- Chambers, Erve, and M. G. Trend. 1981. Fieldwork Ethics in Policy-Oriented Research. *American Anthropologist* 83:626-628.
- Clinton, C. A. 1976. The Anthropologist as Hired Hand. *Human Organization* 34:197-204.
- Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association. Final Draft, March 1, 1997; published in *Anthropology Newsletter* 39(3):10-11, March 1998.
- Deloria, Vine. 1980. Our New Research Society: Some Warnings to Social Scientists. *Social Problems* 27(3):265-271.
- Faden, Ruth R., and T. L. Beauchamp, in collaboration with Nancy M. P. King. 1986. *A History and Theory of Informed Consent*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gallher, John F. 1980. Social Scientists' Ethical Responsibility to Superordinates. *Social Problems* 27(3):298-308.
- Gert, Bernard. 1995. Universal Values and Professional Codes of Ethics. *AAA Newsletter* (October):30-31.

- Green, Edward C., ed. 1984. *Practicing Developmental Anthropology*. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Johnson, Rebecca Lynn, and the students of the University of South Carolina's Ethics and Anthropology class. 1995. Ethics for the Future. *AAA Newsletter* (September):67.
- Jorgensen, Joseph. 1971. On Ethics and Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 12:321-334.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1993. Ethical Dilemmas: Notes from Outside the Field. *Anthropology Newsletter* 34(7):5-6.
- Mead, Margaret. 1969. Research with Human Beings: A Model Derived from Anthropological Field Practice. *Daedalus* 98:361-386.
- Messenger, Phyllis Mauch, ed. 1989. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Culture? Whose Property?* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Pels, Peter. 1994. National Codes of Ethics and European Anthropology: A Call for Cooperation and Exchange. *European Association of Social Anthropology Newsletter* (September):9-10.
- Pelto, Perti, and Gretel Pelto. 1978. *Anthropological Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Professional Ethics*, a multidisciplinary journal (formerly *Business and Professional Ethics*), PO Box 15017, Gainesville, FL 32604.
- Punch, Maurice. 1986. *The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork*. Qualitative Research Methods Series, Vol. 3. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reynolds, Paul Davidson. 1982. *Ethics and Social Science Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rynkiewicz, Michael A., and James P. Spradley, eds. 1976. *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. New York: Wiley.
- Shore, Cris, and A. Ahmed, eds. 1995. *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone.
- Skomal, Susan. 1994. Lessons for the Field—Ethics in Fieldwork. *Anthropology Newsletter* 35(5):1, 4.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E. 1989. Anthropological Advocacy in the Hopi-Navajo Land Dispute. *American Anthropologist* 91:738-743.
- Wax, M. L. and J. Cassell, eds. 1979. *Federal Regulations: Ethical Issues and Social Research*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Whyte, William F. 1958. Freedom and Responsibility in Research: The Springdale Case. *Human Organization* 17:1-2.

Appendix

Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association

I. Preamble

Anthropological researchers, teachers and practitioners are members of many different communities, each with its own moral rules or codes of ethics. Anthropologists have moral obligations as members of other groups, such as the family, religion, and community, as well as the profession. They also have obligations to the scholarly discipline, to the wider society and culture, and to the human species, other species, and the environment. Furthermore, fieldworkers may develop close relationships with persons or animals with whom they work, generating an additional level of ethical considerations.

In a field of such complex involvements and obligations, it is inevitable that misunderstandings, conflicts, and the need to make choices among apparently incompatible values will arise. Anthropologists are responsible for grappling with such difficulties and struggling to resolve them in ways compatible with the principles stated here. The purpose of this Code is to foster discussion and education. The American Anthropological Association (AAA) does not adjudicate claims for unethical behavior.

The principles and guidelines in this Code provide the anthropologist with tools to engage in developing and maintaining an ethical framework for all anthropological work.

II. Introduction

Anthropology is a multidisciplinary field of science and scholarship, which includes the study of all aspects of humankind—archaeological, biological, linguistic, and sociocultural. Anthropology has roots in the natural and social sciences and in the humanities, ranging in approach from basic to applied research and to scholarly interpretation.

As the principal organization representing the breadth of anthropology, the American Anthropological Association (AAA) starts from the position that generating and appropriately utilizing knowledge (i.e., publishing, teaching, developing programs, and informing policy) of the peoples of the world, past and present, is a worthy goal; that the generation of anthropological knowledge is a dynamic process using many different and ever-evolving approaches; and that for moral and practical reasons, the generation and utilization of knowledge should be achieved in an ethical manner.

The mission of American Anthropological Association is to advance all aspects of anthropological research and to foster dissemination of anthropological knowledge through publications, teaching, public education, and application. An important part of that mission is to help educate AAA members about ethical obligations and challenges involved in the generation, dissemination, and utilization of anthropological knowledge.

The purpose of this Code is to provide AAA members and other interested persons with guidelines for making ethical choices in the conduct of their anthropological work. Because

anthropologists can find themselves in complex situations and subject to more than one code of ethics, the AAA Code of Ethics provides a framework, not an ironclad formula, for making decisions.

Persons using the Code as a guideline for making ethical choices or for teaching are encouraged to seek out illustrative examples and appropriate case studies to enrich their knowledge base.

Anthropologists have a duty to be informed about ethical codes relating to their work, and ought periodically to receive training on current research activities and ethical issues. In addition, departments offering anthropology degrees should include and require ethical training in their curriculums.

No code or set of guidelines can anticipate unique circumstances or direct actions in specific situations. The individual anthropologist must be willing to make carefully considered ethical choices and be prepared to make clear the assumptions, facts and issues on which those choices are based. These guidelines therefore address general contexts, priorities and relationships which should be considered in ethical decision making in anthropological work.

III. Research

In both proposing and carrying out research, anthropological researchers must be open about the purpose(s), potential impacts, and source(s) of support for research projects with funders, colleagues, persons studied or providing information, and with relevant parties affected by the research. Researchers must expect to utilize the results of their work in an appropriate fashion and disseminate the results through appropriate and timely activities. Research fulfilling these expectations is ethical, regardless of the source of funding (public or private) or purpose (i.e., "applied," "basic," "pure," or "proprietary").

Anthropological researchers should be alert to the danger of compromising anthropological ethics as a condition to engage in research, yet also be alert to proper demands of good citizenship or host-guest relations. Active contribution and leadership in seeking to shape public or private sector actions and policies may be as ethically justifiable as inaction, detachment, or noncooperation, depending on circumstances. Similar principles hold for anthropological researchers employed or otherwise affiliated with nonanthropological institutions, public institutions, or private enterprises.

A. Responsibility to people and animals with whom anthropological researchers work and whose lives and cultures they study.

1. Anthropological researchers have primary ethical obligations to the people, species, and materials they study and to the people with whom they work. These obligations can supersede the goal of seeking new knowledge, and can lead to decisions not to undertake or to discontinue a research project when the primary obligation conflicts

with other responsibilities, such as those owed to sponsors or clients. These ethical obligations include:

- * To avoid harm or wrong, understanding that the development of knowledge can lead to change which may be positive or negative for the people or animals worked with or studied
- * To respect the well-being of humans and nonhuman primates
- * To work for the long-term conservation of the archaeological, fossil, and historical records
- * To consult actively with the affected individuals or group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved

2. Anthropological researchers must do everything in their power to ensure that their research does not harm the safety, dignity, or privacy of the people with whom they work, conduct research, or perform other professional activities. Anthropological researchers working with animals must do everything in their power to ensure that the research does not harm the safety, psychological well-being or survival of the animals or species with which they work.

3. Anthropological researchers must determine in advance whether their hosts/providers of information wish to remain anonymous or receive recognition, and make every effort to comply with those wishes. Researchers must present to their research participants the possible impacts of the choices, and make clear that despite their best efforts, anonymity may be compromised or recognition fail to materialize.

4. Anthropological researchers should obtain in advance the informed consent of persons being studied, providing information, owning or controlling access to material being studied, or otherwise identified as having interests which might be impacted by the research. It is understood that the degree and breadth of informed consent required will depend on the nature of the project and may be affected by requirements of other codes, laws, and ethics of the country or community in which the research is pursued. Further, it is understood that the informed consent process is dynamic and continuous; the process should be initiated in the project design and continue through implementation by way of dialogue and negotiation with those studied. Researchers are responsible for identifying and complying with the various informed consent codes, laws and regulations affecting their projects. Informed consent, for the purposes of this code, does not necessarily imply or require a particular written or signed form.

It is the quality of the consent, not the format, that is relevant.

5. Anthropological researchers who have developed close and enduring relationships (i.e., covenantal relationships) with either individual persons providing information or with hosts must adhere to the obligations of openness and informed consent, while carefully and respectfully negotiating the limits of the relationship.

6. While anthropologists may gain personally from their work, they must not exploit individuals, groups, animals, or cultural or biological materials. They should recognize their debt to the societies in which they work and their obligation to reciprocate with people studied in appropriate ways.

B. Responsibility to scholarship and science

1. Anthropological researchers must expect to encounter ethical dilemmas at every stage of their work, and must make good-faith efforts to identify potential ethical claims and conflicts in advance when preparing proposals and as projects proceed. A section raising and responding to potential ethical issues should be part of every research proposal.

2. Anthropological researchers bear responsibility for the integrity and reputation of their discipline, of scholarship, and of science. Thus, anthropological researchers are subject to the general moral rules of scientific and scholarly conduct: they should not deceive or knowingly misrepresent (i.e., fabricate evidence, falsify, plagiarize), or attempt to prevent reporting of misconduct, or obstruct the scientific/scholarly research of others.

3. Anthropological researchers should do all they can to preserve opportunities for future fieldworkers to follow them to the field.

4. Anthropological researchers should utilize the results of their work in an appropriate fashion, and whenever possible disseminate their findings to the scientific and scholarly community.

5. Anthropological researchers should seriously consider all reasonable requests for access to their data and other research materials for purposes of research. They should also make every effort to insure preservation of their fieldwork data for use by posterity.

C. Responsibility to the public

1. Anthropological researchers should make the results of their research appropriately available to sponsors, students, decision makers, and other nonanthropologists. In so doing, they must be truthful; they are not only responsible for the factual content of their statements but also must consider carefully the social and political implications of the information they disseminate. They must do everything in their power to insure that such information is well understood, properly contextualized, and responsibly utilized. They should make clear the empirical bases upon which their reports stand, be candid about their qualifications and philosophical or political biases, and recognize and make clear the limits of anthropological expertise. At the same time, they must be alert to possible harm their information may cause people with whom they work or colleagues.

2. Anthropologists may choose to move beyond disseminating research results to a position of advocacy. This is an individual decision, but not an ethical responsibility.

IV. Teaching

Responsibility to students and trainees

While adhering to ethical and legal codes governing relations between teachers/mentors and students/trainees at their educational institutions or as members of wider organizations, anthropological teachers should be particularly sensitive to the ways such codes apply in their discipline (for example, when teaching involves close contact with students/trainees in field situations). Among the widely recognized precepts which anthropological teachers, like other teachers/mentors, should follow are:

1. Teachers/mentors should conduct their programs in ways that preclude discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, "race," social class, political convictions, disability, religion, ethnic background, national origin, sexual orientation, age, or other criteria irrelevant to academic performance.

2. Teachers'/mentors' duties include continually striving to improve their teaching/training techniques; being available and responsive to student/trainee interests; counseling students/trainees realistically regarding career opportunities; conscientiously supervising, encouraging, and supporting students'/trainees' studies; being fair, prompt, and reliable in communicating evaluations; assisting students/trainees in securing research support; and helping students/trainees when they seek professional placement.

3. Teachers/mentors should impress upon students/trainees the ethical challenges involved in every phase of anthropological work; encourage them to reflect upon this and other codes; encourage dialogue with colleagues on ethical issues; and discourage participation in ethically questionable projects.

4. Teachers/mentors should publicly acknowledge student/trainee assistance in research and preparation of their work; give appropriate credit for coauthorship to students/trainees; encourage publication of worthy student/trainee papers; and compensate students/trainees justly for their participation in all professional activities.

5. Teachers/mentors should beware of the exploitation and serious conflicts of interest which may result if they engage in sexual relations with students/trainees. They must avoid sexual liaisons with students/trainees for whose education and professional training they are in any way responsible.

V. Application

1. The same ethical guidelines apply to all anthropological work. That is, in both proposing and carrying out research, anthropologists must be open with funders.

colleagues, persons studied or providing information, and relevant parties affected by the work about the purpose(s), potential impacts, and source(s) of support for the work. Applied anthropologists must intend and expect to utilize the results of their work appropriately (i.e., publication, teaching, program and policy development) within a reasonable time. In situations in which anthropological knowledge is applied, anthropologists bear the same responsibility to be open and candid about their skills and intentions, and monitor the effects of their work on all persons affected. Anthropologists may be involved in many types of work, frequently affecting individuals and groups with diverse and sometimes conflicting interests. The individual anthropologist must make carefully considered ethical choices and be prepared to make clear the assumptions, facts and issues on which those choices are based.

2. In all dealings with employers, persons hired to pursue anthropological research or apply anthropological knowledge should be honest about their qualifications, capabilities, and aims. Prior to making any professional commitments, they must review the purposes of prospective employers, taking into consideration the employer's past activities and future goals. In working for governmental agencies or private businesses, they should be especially careful not to promise or imply acceptance of conditions contrary to professional ethics or competing commitments.

3. Applied anthropologists, as any anthropologist, should be alert to the danger of compromising anthropological ethics as a condition for engaging in research or practice. They should also be alert to proper demands of hospitality, good citizenship and guest status. Proactive contribution and leadership in shaping public or private sector actions and policies may be as ethically justifiable as inaction, detachment, or noncooperation, depending on circumstances.

VI. Epilogue

Anthropological research, teaching, and application, like any human actions, pose choices for which anthropologists individually and collectively bear ethical responsibility. Since anthropologists are members of a variety of groups and subject to a variety of ethical codes, choices must sometimes be made not only between the varied obligations presented in this code but also between those of this code and those incurred in other statuses or roles. This statement does not dictate choice or propose sanctions. Rather, it is designed to promote discussion and provide general guidelines for ethically responsible decisions.

VII. Acknowledgments

This Code was drafted by the Commission to Review the AAA Statements on Ethics during the period January 1995-March 1997. The Commission members were James Peacock (Chair), Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, Barbara Frankel, Kathleen Gibson, Janet Levy, and Murray Wax. In addition, the following individuals participated in the Commission meetings: philosopher Bernard Gert, anthropologists Cathleen Crain, Shirley Fiske, David Freyer, Felix Moos, Yolanda Moses, and Niel Tashima; and members of the American Sociological

Association Committee on Ethics. Open hearings on the Code were held at the 1995 and 1996 annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association. The Commission solicited comments from all AAA Sections. The first draft of the AAA Code of Ethics was discussed at the May 1995 AAA Section Assembly meeting; the second draft was briefly discussed at the November 1996 meeting of the AAA Section Assembly.

The Final Report of the Commission was published in the September 1995 edition of the Anthropology Newsletter and on the AAA web site (<http://www.ameranthassn.org>). Drafts of the Code were published in the April 1996 and 1996 annual meeting edition of the Anthropology Newsletter and the AAA web site, and comments were solicited from the membership. The Commission considered all comments from the membership in formulating the final draft in February 1997. The Commission gratefully acknowledge the use of some language from the codes of ethics of the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology and the Society for American Archaeology.

VIII. Other Relevant Codes of Ethics

The following list of other Codes of Ethics may be useful to anthropological researchers, teachers and practitioners:

Animal Behavior Society 1991. Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research. *Animal Behavior* 41:183-186.

American Board of Forensic Examiners n.d. Code of Ethical Conduct. (American Board of Forensic Examiners, 300 South Jefferson Avenue, Suite 411, Springfield, MO 65806).
Archaeological Institute of America

1991 Code of Ethics. *American Journal of Archaeology* 95:285.

1994 Code of Professional Standards. (Archaeological Institute of America, 675 Commonwealth Ave, Boston, MA 02215-1401. Supplements and expands but does not replace the earlier Code of Ethics).

National Academy of Sciences

1995 *On Being a Scientist: Responsible Conduct in Research*, 2d ed. Washington, DC: National Academy Press (2121 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418).

National Association for the Practice of Anthropology

1988 Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners.

Sigma Xi

1992 Sigma Xi Statement on the Use of Animals in Research. *American Scientist* 80:73-76.

Society for American Archaeology

1996 Principles of Archaeological Ethics. (Society for American Archaeology, 900 Second Street, NE, Suite 12, Washington, DC 20002-3557).

Society for Applied Anthropology

1983 Professional and Ethical Responsibilities. (Revised 1983.)

Society of Professional Archaeologists

1976 Code of Ethics, Standards of Research Performance and Institutional Standards.
(Society of Professional Archaeologists, PO Box 60911, Oklahoma City, OK
73146-0911).

United Nations

1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

1983 United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination
Against Women.

1987 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Forthcoming United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples.



Feminist Methods

Introduction

Anthropology as a field lends itself to feminist methods. First, at least in its North American version, because of the core concern with cultural dynamics and shifting terrains of meaning, it flourishes on the borderland between the social sciences and humanities. This interdisciplinary space is one valued in feminist research in general. Second, anthropology is comparative and historical in scope, permitting those who wish to seek patterns to do so, while remaining skeptical of unified theories based on nationalist assumptions or images of human nature rooted in particular societies. Third, there is a historical tendency in anthropology to focus on the local, the everyday, or the marginal.

At its worst, anthropology can ignore global structures of meaning or transform peoples into exotic objects for consumption by more powerful audiences. At its best, it becomes the witness for human practices that resonate with but are not mere reflexes of, the processes of global capitalism or earlier colonialism, worlds of meaning in the making. Anthropology can value the local, the subordinated, the creation of meaning among those who are not powerful in the reductive sense of wealth or political control or even social prestige. Perhaps it is this tendency that contributed to the formative influence that anthropologists in the early 1970s had in the development of what have become international or transnational feminisms.

Taken narrowly as techniques of investigation, the methods of feminist anthropology—its use of fieldwork, interviews, surveys, and quantitative data collection—aren't distinct from those of other critical methods in anthropology.