



**ETHICAL
ISSUES IN
COVERT,
SECURITY AND
SURVEILLANCE
RESEARCH**

EDITED BY
**RON IPHOFEN
DÓNAL O'MATHÚNA**

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH
ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

 **OPEN ACCESS
BOOK**

**ETHICAL ISSUES IN COVERT,
SECURITY AND SURVEILLANCE
RESEARCH**

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

Series Editor: Dr Ron Iphofen, *FACSS, Independent
Consultant, France*

Recent volumes:

Volume 1: Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the
Social Sciences, Edited by *Ron Iphofen*

Volume 2: The Ethics of Online Research, Edited by *Kandy Woodfield*

Volume 3: Virtue Ethics in the Conduct and Governance of Social Science
Research, Edited by *Nathan Emmerich*

Volume 4: Ethics and Integrity in Health and Life Sciences Research, Edited by
Zvonimir Koporc

Volume 5: Ethics and Integrity in Visual Research Methods, Edited by *Savannah
Dodd*

Volume 6: Indigenous Research Ethics, Edited by *Lily George, Juan Tauri and
Lindsey Te Ata o Tu MacDonald*

Volume 7: Ethics and Integrity in Research with Children and Young People,
Edited by *Grace Spencer*

Editorial Advisory Group

Professor Robert Dingwall, *FACSS, Dingway Enterprises Ltd and Nottingham
Trent University, UK*

Dr Nathan Emmerich, *Institute of Ethics, Dublin City University and Queens
University Belfast, UK*

Professor Mark Israel, *University of Western Australia, Australia*

Dr Janet Lewis, *AcSS, Former Research Director, Joseph Rowntree Foundation,
UK*

Professor John Oates, *FACSS, Open University, UK*

Associate Professor Martin Tolich, *University of Otago, New Zealand*

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY
VOLUME 8

ETHICAL ISSUES IN COVERT, SECURITY AND SURVEILLANCE RESEARCH

EDITED BY

RON IPHOFEN

Independent Consultant, France

AND

DÓNAL O'MATHÚNA

The Ohio State University, USA



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2022



Open access. Editorial matter and selection © 2022 Ron Iphofen and Dónal O’Mathúna. Individual chapters © belongs to the respective chapter authors. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. These works are published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters’ suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80262-414-4 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-80262-411-3 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-80262-413-7 (Epub)

ISSN: 2398-6018 (Series)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

<i>About the Editors</i>	vii
<i>About the Contributors</i>	ix
<i>About the Series Editor</i>	xv
<i>Series Preface</i> <i>Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxi
Introduction: Ethical Issues in Covert, Security and Surveillance Research <i>Ron Iphofen and Dónal O’Mathúna</i>	1
Chapter 1 Surveillance Ethics: An Introduction to an Introduction <i>Kevin Macnish</i>	9
Chapter 2 Science, Ethics, and Responsible Research – The Case of Surveillance <i>Alfonso Alfonsi and Maresa Berliri</i>	17
Chapter 3 Research Is Not a Private Matter <i>Paul Spicker</i>	29
Chapter 4 Covert Research Ethics <i>Marco Marzano</i>	41
Chapter 5 Taking Shortcuts: Correlation, Not Causation, and the Moral Problems it Brings <i>Kevin Macnish</i>	55
Chapter 6 The Big Data World: Benefits, Threats and Ethical Challenges <i>Marina Da Bormida</i>	71

Chapter 7 Health Data, Public Interest, and Surveillance for Non-health-related Purposes	
<i>Mark Taylor and Richard Kirkham</i>	93
Chapter 8 Privacy and Security: German Perspectives, European Trends and Ethical Implications	
<i>Hartmut Aden</i>	119
Chapter 9 A Framework for Reviewing Dual Use Research	
<i>Simon E. Kolstoe</i>	131
Chapter 10 Security Risk Management in Hostile Environments: Community-based and Systems-based Approaches	
<i>Daniel Paul and Alex Stedmon</i>	145
Chapter 11 Conducting Ethical Research in Sensitive Security Domains: Understanding Threats and the Importance of Building Trust	
<i>Alex Stedmon and Daniel Paul</i>	159
Chapter 12 Covert Aspects of Surveillance and the Ethical Issues They Raise	
<i>David J. Harper, Darren Ellis and Ian Tucker</i>	177
Guidance Notes for Reviewers and Policymakers on Covert, Deceptive and Surveillance Research	
<i>Ron Iphofen, Simon E. Kolstoe, Kevin Macnish, Paul Spicker and Dónal O’Mathúna</i>	199
<i>Index</i>	211

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Ron Iphofen, FAcSS (British), is an Independent Consultant based in France with international recognition for expertise on research ethics and professional standards in research. Since 2008, he has presented at over 200 national and international events for universities, government, research institutes and the European Commission (EC) and European Research Council (ERC). He has served in the Universities Sector of the Association for Research Ethics UK. He has acted as consultant, adviser and/or delivered training on research ethics for the Scottish Executive, UK Government Social Research, National Disability Authority (Ireland), National Centre for Social Research, Social Research Association, Audit Commission, Food Standards Agency, Ministry of Justice, BIG Lottery, Local Authorities' Consortium, UK Research Integrity Office, Skills Development Scotland, ANR (French Research Funding agency), SSRC (Canada) and many others. His primary consultative activity at present is for the EC Ethics Unit, Directorate General for Science and Innovation, the Research Executive Agency and the ERC.

Dónal O'Mathúna (Irish) is Associate Professor at The Ohio State University, USA, in the College of Nursing and the Center for Bioethics in the College of Medicine. He is the Director of the Cochrane Affiliate at Ohio State's Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare, and a member of the Executive Committee of the Cochrane US Network, which reflects his long-standing involvement with Cochrane, a major producer of reliable health evidence. His interests in bioethics focus on ethical issues in humanitarian settings, disasters and pandemics. He is Visiting Professor of Ethics in the European Masters in Disaster Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Italy. He has led funded research projects into humanitarian research ethics, and has contributed to ethics initiatives and guidelines with the World Health Organization, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund and other international agencies. He has co-edited three volumes addressing various ethical issues in disasters, and has authored numerous peer-reviewed articles.

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Hartmut Aden is a Lawyer and Political Scientist. He is Professor of German and European Public Law, Public Policy and Public Administration at the Berlin School of Economics and Law/Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht (HWR Berlin), Vice President for Research of HWR Berlin and member of the Berlin Institute for Safety and Security Research (FÖPS Berlin). He is the founding Academic Director of the MA Programme in International Security Management established in 2018.

Alfonso Alfonsi has more than 35 years of experience at international level in social research, training, evaluation and scientific networking. His expertise includes urban development, poverty and social exclusion, religion and modernisation, science ethics and science policies, social and cultural change and socialisation of scientific and technological research. He works as an Expert for organisations of the UN system (such as United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, HABITAT, WORLD BANK and United Nations Development Programme), for the European Union and for Italian bodies (such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs, National Research Council, Lazio Regional Government and Puglia Regional Government). In this framework, he has directed and/or participated in several research projects in Europe, Africa and Asia.

He serves as Science Ethics Expert for the European Commission, by participating in expert groups and evaluation panels (in Seventh Framework Programme and in HORIZON 2020 frameworks).

He participated as an expert in UN high level encounters and other international partnerships, contributing in the drafting of position papers and in the formulation of policy documents and manifestos. He has coordinated international multi-stakeholder networks for development, such as the Network on Services for the Urban Poor of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council or the UN-Habitat International Forum of Researchers on Human Settlements.

Maresa Berliri is a Sociologist who has participated in several research projects focussed on the relations between science and society; Responsible Research and Innovation in research performing organisations; social subjectivity on the web and privacy protection; internet governance and digital transition; active citizenship and relations between states and citizens; women in political, scientific and entrepreneurial organisations; and in poverty and social exclusion. Among these projects, it is worth highlighting: CONSENT (consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content service in the digital economy), MAPPING (managing alternatives for privacy, property and internet governance) and RESPECT (rules, expectations and security through privacy enhanced convenient

technologies). She is currently involved in some H2020 Projects including: PRO-RES (PROmoting integrity in the use of RESearch results) and RESBIOS (RESponsible research and innovation grounding practices in BIOSciences).

Marina Da Bormida is an R&I Lawyer and Ethics Expert in Italy. She obtained her degree in Law and PhD degree in Legal Issues of the Information Society. She specialised in legal, ethical and societal themes related to information and communication technology research and technological developments in the framework of R&D national and European projects in a wide range of domains (e.g. Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, digital lifestyle, Internet of Things, Factories of the Future and Smart Manufacturing, Cloud Computing, Smart Contracts and Blockchain), with consolidated experience and long-term scientific collaboration with well-known research institutions.

Dr Darren Ellis is a chartered Psychologist, Senior Lecturer at the University of East London and Course Leader of the Psychosocial Community Work programme. He is co-author of *Emotion in the Digital Age: Technologies, Data and Psychosocial Life* (Routledge, 2020) for Routledge's Studies in Science, Technology and Society Series and *Social Psychology of Emotion* (Sage, 2015). He co-edited *After lockdown, Opening Up: Psychosocial Transformations in the Wake of Covid-19* (Palgrave, 2021) for Palgrave's Studies in the Psychosocial and *Affect and Social Media: Emotion, Mediation, Anxiety and Contagion* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2018) for Rowman and Littlefield's Radical Cultural Studies Series. He has published articles on a wide range of topics including surveillance studies, for example: 'Stop and Search: Disproportionality, Discretion and Generalisations' (2010, *Police Journal*), 'The Affective Atmospheres of Surveillance' (2013, *Theory and Psychology*) and 'Techno-securitisation of Everyday Life and Cultures of Surveillance—Apatheia' (2020, *Science as Culture*).

David J. Harper is Professor of Clinical Psychology and Programme Director (Academic) of the Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology at the University of East London, UK. He has co-authored and co-edited a number of books including *Psychology, Mental Health and Distress* (Red Globe Press, 2013), *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy* (Wiley, 2012) and *Deconstructing Psychopathology* (Sage, 1995). He has published journal articles and book chapters on public understandings of surveillance, discourses of paranoia, conspiracy and surveillance in clinical and popular cultures and the history of psychological and psychiatric involvement in national security interrogations.

Richard Kirkham is an Administrative Justice Lawyer whose main research area of interest is on redress mechanisms in the administrative justice system and judicial review. His recent publications include *Executive Decision-making and the Courts: Revisiting the Origins of Modern Judicial Review* (Hart Publishing, 2021, edited with T. T. Arvind, Daithí Mac Síthigh and Lindsay Stirton), *A Manifesto for Ombudsman Reform* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2020, edited with C. Gill) and *The*

Oxford Handbook of Administrative Justice (OUP, Forthcoming, edited with M. Hertogh, R. Thomas and J. Tomlinson).

Simon E. Kolstoe, is a Reader in Bioethics at the University of Portsmouth, and chair of the UK's Ministry of Defence Research Ethics Committee (MODREC). Following a PhD in Biochemistry and ten years conducting Medical Research, his academic and research interests are now focussed on how Ethics, Governance and Integrity processes impact the reliability and effectiveness of medical and human participant research. He also chairs research ethics committees for the UK Health Security Agency and Health Research Authority.

Kevin Macnish is Digital Ethics Consulting Manager with Sopra Steria. A former Analyst and Manager at the UK Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) and the the US Government Department of Defense (US DOD), he gained his PhD in Digital Ethics from the University of Leeds in 2013. He has been interviewed by BBC national television and radio and has spoken at both the House of Commons and the House of Lords in relation to digital ethics. Prior to joining Sopra Steria, he was Assistant Professor in Ethics and IT in the Philosophy Department at the University of Twente where his research and consultancy work focussed on the ethics of privacy, artificial intelligence and cybersecurity. He published *The Ethics of Surveillance: An Introduction* (Routledge, 2018) and *Big Data and Democracy* (Edinburgh University Press, 2020). He has published more than 30 academic articles and chapters in his areas of interest, including the chapter on cybersecurity ethics in the forthcoming *Handbook on Digital Ethics* (Oxford University Press) and is a frequent speaker at international trade and academic conferences. He is an independent Ethics Expert for the European Commission, visiting PhD Supervisor at the University of Twente and a member of the International Association of Privacy Professionals' Research Advisory Board.

Marco Marzano is Professor of Sociology of Organizations at the University of Bergamo, Italy. His research focusses on religion, Catholicism, cancer, illness narrative and organisation theory. In terms of methodological approaches, he is interested in ethnography, qualitative research, investigative methods and covert research. He has a strong interest in social research ethics. He is the author of numerous international publications in different languages (English, German, Italian and soon Polish and French) and he has been a visiting professor at many universities in different countries around the world (from the UK to the USA, from Brazil to Argentina, from the Czech Republic to Romania). He has participated in numerous international conferences, sometimes as a keynote speaker.

Daniel Paul is a Security Risk Management Consultant, with a specialism in crisis management and security for high-risk environments. He started out his career in the British Army before briefly working a project manager for the humanitarian sector. It was here he realised he had a passion for keeping others safe and moved into the security management field. He completed his PhD in 2019, where he studied the

role of knowledge management in keeping humanitarian workers safe when working in dangerous environments. His PhD provided a knowledge management framework for eliciting and sharing security specific information within organisations in order to improve security risk management systems. He also holds a Bachelors in International Security and Disaster Management. Alongside consultancy work, he lectures at Coventry University in Disaster Management. He runs modules in disaster preparedness, humanitarian essentials and lectures on the topics of security management, disaster response and risk management.

Paul Spicker is a writer and commentator on Social Policy. His published work includes 20 books, several shorter works and over 100 academic papers. His studies of housing and welfare rights developed from his early career; since then, his research has included studies related to benefit delivery systems, the care of old people, psychiatric patients, housing management and local anti-poverty strategy. He is a consultant on social welfare in practice, and has done work for a range of agencies at local, national and international levels. After teaching at Nottingham Trent University and the University of Dundee, he held the Grampian Chair of Public Policy at Robert Gordon University (RGU) from 2001 to 2015, and was Director of its Centre for Public Policy and Management. He is now an Emeritus Professor of RGU.

Alex Stedmon, CSci CPsychol CERgHF AFBPsS FCIEHF FRSA, is a Professor of Human Factors specialising in security and defence. He has also been elected as President of the Chartered Institute of Ergonomics and Human Factors (2022) and been awarded a Royal Academy of Engineering Visiting Professor role in the Psychology Department at Cardiff University. He previously worked for the Ministry of Defence before a move into academia where his research focussed on human factors issues of technology use and contextual methods for investigating public safety in various security environments. He was a Technical Lead on a Strategic Security Project in the run up to the London Olympics and has conducted pioneering research in deception, safeguarding public spaces and novel collaborative networks for security. He has contributed to winning over £33million of research funding to date and has over 230 mainly peer-reviewed publications. He was the lead Editor of the first book on *Counter-terrorism and Hostile Intent: Human Factors Theory and Application* (Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015). During his university career, he was chair of various ethics committees and Deputy Director of Ethics for the Faculty of Engineering at Coventry University. In 2019, he retired from academia to work as a consultant for various international clients and conduct expert witness roles for the courts.

Mark Taylor is an Associate Professor in Health Law and Regulation at Melbourne Law School and Deputy Director of the research group HeLEX, which focusses on the legal and regulatory frameworks governing new health technologies. His own research is focussed on the regulation of personal information with emphasis on health and genetic data. He seeks to develop a concept of privacy that is capable of reconciling individual and community (privacy) interests with a broader (public) interest in access, use and management of personal health information.

Ian Tucker is Professor of Health and Social Psychology at The University of East London. His research interests include mental health, emotion and affect, digital media and surveillance. He has published empirical and theoretical work on care and recovery in a range of environments for mental health support, digital peer support in mental health and surveillance. He is currently working on a UKRI MARCH Network+ project exploring the impact of digital platforms in relation to ‘community assets’ (e.g. arts and creative communities) and experiences of mental ill-health. He is co-author of *Social Psychology of Emotion* (Sage, 2020) and *Emotion in the Digital Age: Technologies, Data and Psychosocial Life* (Routledge, 2020), for Routledge’s Studies in Science, Technology and Society Series.

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE SERIES EDITOR

Ron Iphofen, FAcSS, is Executive Editor of the Emerald book series *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity* and edited Volume 1 in the series, *Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the Social Sciences* (2017). He is an Independent Research Consultant, a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Society of Medicine. Since retiring as Director of Postgraduate Studies in the School of Healthcare Sciences, Bangor University, his major activity has been as an Adviser to the European Commission (EC) and its agencies, the European Research Council (ERC) and the Research Executive Agency on both the Seventh Framework Programme and the Horizon 2020. His consultancy work has covered a range of research agencies (in government and independent) across Europe. He was Vice Chair of the UK Social Research Association (SRA), updated their Ethics Guidelines and now convenes the SRA's Research Ethics Forum. He was Scientific Consultant on the EC RESPECT project – establishing pan-European standards in the social sciences and chaired the Ethics and Societal Impact Advisory Group for another EC-funded European Demonstration Project on mass transit security (SECUR-ED). He has advised the UK Research Integrity Office, the National Disability Authority of the Irish Ministry of Justice, the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, the Scottish Executive, UK Government Social Research, National Centre for Social Research, the Audit Commission, the Food Standards Agency, the Ministry of Justice, the BIG Lottery, a UK Local Authorities' Consortium, Skills Development Scotland, Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR the French Research Funding agency) among many others. He was founding Executive Editor of the Emerald gerontology journal *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*. He published *Ethical Decision Making in Social Research: A Practical Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009 and 2011) and coedited with Martin Tolich *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (Sage, 2018). He is currently leading a new €2.8M European Commission-funded project (PRO-RES) that aims at promoting ethics and integrity in all non-medical research (2018–2021).

This page intentionally left blank

SERIES PREFACE

Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)

This book series, *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity*, grew out of foundational work with a group of Fellows of the UK Academy of Social Sciences who were all concerned to ensure that lessons learned from previous work were built upon and improved in the interests of the production of robust research practices of high quality. Duplication or unnecessary repetitions of earlier research and ignorance of existing work were seen as hindrances to research progress. Individual researchers, research professions and society all suffer in having to pay the costs in time, energy and money of delayed progress and superfluous repetitions. There is little excuse for failure to build on existing knowledge and practice given modern search technologies unless selfish ‘domain protectionism’ leads researchers to ignore existing work and seek credit for innovations already accomplished. Our concern was to aid well-motivated researchers to quickly discover existing progress made in ethical research in terms of topic, method and/or discipline and to move on with their own work more productively and to discover the best, most effective means to disseminate their own findings so that other researchers could, in turn, contribute to research progress.

It is true that there is a plethora of ethics codes and guidelines with researchers left to themselves to judge those more appropriate to their proposed activity. The same questions are repeatedly asked on discussion forums about how to proceed when similar long-standing problems in the field are being confronted afresh by novice researchers. Researchers and members of ethics review boards alike are faced with selecting the most appropriate codes or guidelines for their current purpose, eliding differences and similarities in a labyrinth of uncertainty. It is no wonder that novice researchers can despair in their search for guidance and experienced researchers may be tempted by the ‘checklist mentality’ that appears to characterise a meeting of formalised ethics requirements and permit their conscience-free pursuit of a cherished programme of research.

If risks of harm to the public and to researchers are to be kept to a minimum and if professional standards in the conduct of scientific research are to be maintained, the more that fundamental understandings of ethical behaviour in research are shared the better. If progress is made in one sphere everyone gains from it being generally acknowledged and understood. If foundational work is conducted everyone gains from being able to build on and develop further that work.

Nor can it be assumed that formal ethics review committees are able to resolve the dilemmas or meet the challenges involved. Enough has been written about such review bodies to make their limitations clear. Crucially, they cannot follow researchers into the field to monitor their every action; they cannot anticipate all of the emergent ethical dilemmas nor, even, follow through to the publication of findings. There is no adequate penalty for neglect through incompetence, nor worse, for conscious omissions of evidence. We have to rely upon the virtues of the individual researcher alongside the skills of journal reviewers and funding agency evaluators. We need to constantly monitor scientific integrity at the corporate and at the individual level. These are issues of quality as well as morality.

Within the research ethics field new problems, issues and concerns and new ways of collecting data continue to emerge regularly. This should not be surprising as social, economic and technological change necessitate constant re-evaluation of research conduct. Standard approaches to research ethics such as valid informed consent, inclusion/exclusion criteria, vulnerable subjects and covert studies need to be re-considered as developing social contexts and methodological innovation, interdisciplinary research and economic pressures pose new challenges to convention. Innovations in technology and method challenge our understanding of 'the public' and 'the private'. Researchers need to think even more clearly about the balance of harm and benefit to their subjects, to themselves and to society. This series proposes to address such new and continuing challenges for both funders, research managers, research ethics committees and researchers in the field as they emerge. The concerns and interests are global and well recognised by researchers and commissioners alike around the world but with varying commitments at both the procedural and the practical levels. This series is designed to suggest realistic solutions to these challenges – this practical angle is the *unique selling proposition* for the series. Each volume will raise and address the key issues in the debates, but also strive to suggest ways forward that maintain the key ethical concerns of respect for human rights and dignity, while sustaining pragmatic guidance for future research developments. A series such as this aims to offer practical help and guidance in actual research engagements as well as meeting the often varied and challenging demands of research ethics review. The approach will not be one of abstract moral philosophy; instead it will seek to help researchers think through the potential harms and benefits of their work in the proposal stage and assist their reflection of the big ethical moments that they face in the field often when there may be no one to advise them in terms of their societal impact and acceptance.

While the research community can be highly imaginative both in the fields of study and methodological innovation, the structures of management and funding, and the pressure to publish to fulfil league table quotas can pressure researchers into errors of judgement that have personal and professional consequences. The series aims to adopt an approach that promotes good practice and sets principles, values and standards that serve as models to aid successful research outcomes. There is clear international appeal as commissioners and researchers alike share a vested interest in the global promotion of professional virtues that lead to the public acceptability of good research. In an increasingly global world in

research terms, there is little point in applying too localised a morality, nor one that implies a solely Western hegemony of values. If standards ‘matter’, it seems evident that they should ‘matter’ to and for all. Only then can the growth of interdisciplinary and multi-national projects be accomplished effectively and with a shared concern for potential harms and benefits. While a diversity of experience and local interests is acknowledged, there are existing, proven models of good practice which can help research practitioners in emergent nations build their policies and processes to suit their own circumstances. We need to see that consensus positions effectively guide the work of scientists across the globe and secure minimal participant harm and maximum societal benefit – and, additionally, that instances of fraudulence, corruption and dishonesty in science decrease as a consequence.

Perhaps some forms of truly independent formal ethics scrutiny can help maintain the integrity of research professions in an era of enhanced concerns over data security, privacy and human rights legislation. But it is essential to guard against rigid conformity to what can become administrative procedures. The consistency we seek to assist researchers in understanding what constitutes ‘proper behaviour’ does not imply uniformity. Having principles does not lead inexorably to an adherence to principlism. Indeed, sincerely held principles can be in conflict in differing contexts. No one practice is necessarily the best approach in all circumstances. But if researchers are aware of the range of possible ways in which their work can be accomplished ethically and with integrity, they can be free to apply the approach that works or is necessary in their setting. Guides to ‘good’ ways of doing things should not be taken as the ‘only’ way of proceeding. A rigidity in outlook does no favours to methodological innovation, nor to the research subjects or participants that they are supposed to protect. If there were to be any principles that should be rigidly adhered to they should include flexibility, open-mindedness, the recognition of the range of challenging situations to be met in the field – principles that in essence amount to a sense of proportionality. And these principles should apply equally to researchers and ethics reviewers alike. To accomplish that requires ethics reviewers to think afresh about each new research proposal, to detach from pre-formed opinions and prejudices, while still learning from and applying the lessons of the past. Principles such as these must also apply to funding and commissioning agencies, to research institutions and to professional associations and their learned societies. Our integrity as researchers demands that we recognise that the rights of our funders and research participants and/or subjects are to be valued alongside our cherished research goals and seek to embody such principles in the research process from the outset. This series will strive to seek just how that might be accomplished in the best interests of all.

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This open access collection was made possible and commissioned under the auspices of the EU-funded PRO-RES Project. PRO-RES is a European Commission-funded project aiming to PROMote ethics and integrity in non-medical RESearch by building an evidence-supported guidance framework for all non-medical sciences and humanities disciplines adopting social science methodologies. The project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 788352. The editors are consortium partners and the authors for the chapters represent a range of stakeholders committed to the aims of the project – including other consortium partners. The editors wish to express their gratitude for the care and commitment demonstrated by the authors to this collection in addressing the sensitive and complex ethical issues raised in this research arena.

CHAPTER 4

COVERT RESEARCH ETHICS

Marco Marzano

ABSTRACT

Covert research has a mixed reputation within the scientific community. Some are unsure of its moral worth, others would proscribe it entirely. This reputation stems largely from a lack of knowledge about the reasons for choosing the covert method. In this chapter, these reasons will be reconstructed in detail and all the elements that will allow one to judge the level of ethicality of covert research will be laid out for the reader. In particular, the chapter will answer the following questions: What harms can result from covert research to the subjects participating in the research? Is covert research necessarily deceptive? In which cases is it ethically permissible for a researcher to deceive? What is the scientific added value of the covert research, that is, what does covert research discover that overt research does not? What are the risks to researchers acting undercover? Finally, some suggestions will be offered to research ethics reviewers to help in their appraisal of covert research.

Keywords: Covert research; deception; research ethics committees; social research ethics; qualitative research; investigative social research

Covert research is clearly not to everyone's analytic taste but the commitment is to explore different and creative ways of constructing ethnographic narratives. The covert ethnographic role can be a deeply artful one that offers a way to form intimate insider accounts about a wide range of topics. It should become a more standard part of the ethnographic

Ethical Issues in Covert, Security and Surveillance Research
Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Volume 8, 41–53



Copyright © 2022 by Marco Marzano. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. These works are published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>
ISSN: 2398-6018/doi:10.1108/S2398-60182021000008005

craft (Atkinson, 2015) rather than be outcast as a methodological pariah. In certain forms of autoethnography, online lurking within cyber ethnography and bystander observations of public behaviours, there seems to be a growing appetite for covert research, although it is certainly not becoming mainstream. There remains a classic fear and fascination about covert research. (Calvey, 2019, p. 259)

INTRODUCTION

Covert research – research which is done without informing those involved (i.e. the ‘subjects’ of research) – has been labouring under a negative reputation in the academic community for some decades (Barnes, 1963; Calvey, 2017; Erikson, 1966; Herrera, 1999; Homan, 1980; Shils, 1982; Warwick, 1982). The origin of the disgrace into which covert research has fallen, after a long period of grace,¹ is to be sought in the fact that it is seen as extremely ethically and morally dubious. This suspicion of the perceived dangers of covert research is shared by both the members of many research ethics review committees (RECs) or institutional review boards (IRBs) which promote a rigorous code of ethics, believing that it violates many of the rights of those being studied in an unacceptable way, and many scholars, especially sociologists and anthropologists, who have done various forms of collaborative research over recent years. These latter believe that covert research does incalculable damage to the pact between researchers and those they study that they have taken such care to construct (Christians, 2000; Denzin, 1997; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Noddings, 2003). These attitudes as a whole have led to the complete marginalisation of covert research, with many RECs and IRBs beginning to ban it in all circumstances and many researchers having stopped doing it altogether. Today covert research is a method used, with some difficulty, by a markedly limited number of researchers (Calvey, 2017).

I would argue that this is a highly negative development in academic terms and that the stigmatising of covert research on ethical grounds is excessive and unjust. In this chapter, I will argue that there are many reasons why covert research can be considered ethically acceptable. I will abstain from listing the accusations traditionally levelled at covert research² as these are extremely well known and I focus instead on the motives which have, both implicitly and explicitly, been marshalled in support of this research method.

In general, I believe that it is possible to distinguish between two overall approaches to the defence of covert research, one moderate and one radical. These two perspectives reflect different visions of research ethics, the duties of researchers and the rights of those involved particularly in social science research. I will illustrate both perspectives, starting from the moderate approach. But first I should clarify that my thinking will refer primarily to qualitative research (Hammersley, 2020) and not other forms of research (such as experiments), and focus on work in sociology and social psychology and, to a lesser extent, anthropology.

THE MODERATE DEFENCE OF THE GROUNDS FOR COVERT RESEARCH

The moderate approach to covert research has certainly been the most widespread of the two approaches within the social science community (Calvey, 2008; Lugosi, 2006; Perez, 2019; Roulet, Gill, Stenger, & Gill, 2017; Spicker, 2011).

The exponents of this approach do not invoke total researcher freedom calling for an end to all forms of ethics regulation. Quite the contrary, they assert that, if done in a certain way, covert research can and must be considered compatible with the ethics standards currently prevalent in the academic community. This approach might even be called ‘reformist’, as its objective is to bring certain types of covert research into the legitimate and recognised methods fold and demonstrate its compatibility with overt methods.

To this end, the moderates or reformers have put forward the following arguments:

Lying Must Be an Exception

In the first place the ‘reformers’ argue that lying is not to be considered a ‘normal’, natural part of social sciences research and that, where possible, researchers must behave honestly and make participants aware of the real reason for their presence in the field. This is especially the case where research is on vulnerable or fragile people. And in any case social scientists should be called on to justify their ethical behaviour and field work choices before ethics committees or, in the absence of these, in the sections of their articles dealing with methodology and ethics (Lugosi, 2006).

Overt and Covert Research Are Not Clearly Distinguishable

Reiterating this point, that is, that intentional and blatant lying cannot be tolerated as a normal research method (Spicker, 2011), the moderate defenders of covert research argue that a situation in which the subjects of research are truly fully informed and aware of a researcher’s purposes and intentions is closer to myth than to real life (Fine, 1993; Fine & Shulman, 2009). From this perspective, it is argued, covert and overt research cannot be seen as easily identifiable and distinguishable entities (Calvey, 2017; McKenzie 2009) and even in the best overt research there are inevitably many opaque elements, ambiguities and a lack of transparency and clarity. In this respect, the informed consent practices now widespread do not avert doubt and confusion (Marzano, 2012; Traianou & Hammersley, 2020) and would frequently seem, beyond significantly limiting research freedom, to serve more to defend the interests and reputation of academic institutions than to protect the people studied (Hedgecoe, 2016; Murphy & Dingwall, 2007; Van den Hoonard, 2011).

Informing Subjects Is Sometimes Really Impossible

Sometimes it is a research location which determines whether or not research work can be performed in a fully open way (Lugosi, 2006; Spicker, 2011). This is

the case of ethnographic work done in public places such as town squares, open air markets, football stadiums and so on. In such situations, it is obviously impossible for ethnographers to inform everyone they meet of the fact that research is underway (Traianou & Hammersley, 2020). In any case, those going to public places know that they are exposing themselves to the public gaze and thus any social analysts that could be present.³ This is also true of those lacking private spaces and living permanently in public places (such as the homeless people studied by Perez, 2019).

Informed Consent Can Never Cover Everything That Happens in the Field

A further element rendering much research at least partially covert is the fact that isolating research from other contexts can be an extremely complex matter and much of researchers' most significant information is acquired in the field in informal, random conversations in corridors, exchanges of opinion and friendly chats on the margins of formal interviews. What could researchers do about this? Shed all information acquired in this context? Should such valuable information regarding an understanding of, say, an organisational culture really be thrown away solely because it has been sourced from ordinary human conversations outside a research protocol formally approved by an ethics committee? Not to speak of all those behaviours which researchers put into practice in their contacts with those they study designed to manage impressions or rather improve their reputations in the eyes of those they are studying for the purposes of obtaining specific benefits and better access to the information of interest to them.

Sometimes the Most Important Things Are Learned through Unintentional Covert Research

More generally, we should not imagine that the places in which ethnographic work takes place resemble the Trobriand islands in Malinowski's work, where strangers are rarely to be seen. In contemporary advanced industrial (and post-industrial) societies, the lion's share of places and spaces are packed with people coming and going freely, appearing on the scene briefly or barging in without researchers being given the chance to warn them of their presence. I can illustrate with a personal experience of mine relating to research into people dying of cancer which I did some years ago in a large Italian hospital. The research began in a semi-covert way (Marzano, 2007) in the sense that the hospital staff knew about the project and that the head of the hospital ward had approved it. The last part of this ethnographic project was overt, with everyone (staff, patients and their relatives) being informed of its nature and purposes. It was, however, precisely in this last phase of my field work that something totally unforeseen occurred: one day I was in the staff room of the palliative care ward intent on writing up some of my field notes when a doctor (dietician) suddenly came in together with the wife and daughter of a patient. The three of them acted as if I was not there (perhaps the doctor assumed I was a colleague although I was not wearing a white coat), sat down at the other end of the table and the doctor proceeded to explain the best diet and food to be given to the patient (last stage terminally ill) to the

two women. I witnessed the whole conversation in silence and it was an extremely chilling conversation in which a patient entirely unaware of his real condition was treated like a pet to be induced to eat certain foods with little tricks. I wrote out the dialogue in my diary and then added it to my research in rigorously anonymous form (Marzano, 2004). Many years later, I still believe I was right to do so because those few minutes of dialogue were a stark representation of the dehumanisation of the patient and brought across very clearly the way the terminally ill were treated in Italy to my readers. Unintentional covert research can also sometimes be very fruitful.

Informed Consent Inevitably Concerns Only the Initial Research Design

It should also be borne in mind that, as is well known, the qualitative research framework is extremely flexible (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 265; Wiles et al., 2007), subject to ongoing restructuring and redefining and changing frequently during the course of a researcher's field work (Calvey, 2008; Lugosi, 2006). For this reason, it can indeed happen that the information supplied at the outset of research, and for which informed consent may have been obtained from participants, will no longer be complete or up-to-date at a later point in the research. Researchers are very rarely able (or willing) to inform participants of such changes and these latter are, in any case, not sociologists and anthropologists and unlikely to be interested in finding out more about the details of what social scientists do, their curiosities and research interests. Very frequently, what participants are most interested in is something researchers are also keen to ensure, namely being able to get on with what they are doing, without too many interruptions and excessive disturbances, working, interacting and going about their normal lives without being disturbed by ethnographers' presence or words. Keeping them constantly informed as to changing research strategies would be a nuisance, a source of irritation, to them. The result, however, is that in this case, too, researchers' objectives and intentions are partially covert.

A Covert Method May Be the Most Suitable Way of Getting Into the Field

The moderate defenders of research also argue that acting covertly can sometimes be ethically admissible on the grounds that its time frame is limited as is its purpose, serving solely to facilitate the researcher's access to the field. In certain contexts, in fact, researchers revealing their true identity may be prejudicial to the very potential for the research, in the last analysis. For example, at the time of his research into gay bars, Lugosi (2006) believed that it would have been dangerously counterproductive for him to have revealed, right from the start, the real reasons for his presence and that it was far better to build up solid friendships during his hours of work as a barman, and the many free time hours he chose to spend there, before doing so. In all cases such as this, acting covertly is an exceptional and momentary state in which researchers commit to making their true identity known as soon as possible to the largest possible number of people. Acting covertly is simply a necessary expedient with which to initiate research in a social environment to which it would otherwise have been very difficult to gain

access. It is possible that most if not all field research can begin in this state of 'naturally covert observation' which gives rise to a topic of research enquiry in the first place.

It Is Not Always the Researcher Who Chooses to Hide His/Her Identity

In certain situations working undercover is not an independent or free choice and it is researchers' gatekeepers who require this as a precondition for allowing them access to the field (Traianou & Hammersley, 2020). This has happened to me twice (Marzano, 2018): the first time when I was studying people dying of cancer and the head of the hospital's oncology ward whom I had contacted through a common friend told the doctors and nurses on the ward who I was and then that if I wanted to observe what went on there all I needed to do was to put on a white coat and tell patients and their relatives that I was a trainee. The second time was when the heads of a Catholic group I was studying proposed that I take part in an educational week of theirs but only on condition that I did not tell the other participants that I was a sociologist and not a member of the community like all the others: 'The risk would be that they would feel like laboratory guinea pigs', I was told, 'and would get annoyed.' In both cases the only alternative would have been breaking off the research. The fact is that, in the groups and organisations we study there are significant power imbalances and these can be visible not only in the decisions of the organisation's heads to impose the researcher's presence (disregarding the consent of the others) but also, in some cases, not revealing the presence of the researcher to those involved. In such cases, challenging this norm, making one's identity explicit, would mean challenging the hierarchy, casting doubt on the right of the heads to decide (Traianou & Hammersley, 2020).

Sometimes Asking for Subjects' Consent Is Impractical or Inappropriate

In other research, the obstacles to overt research consist in the fact that (a) the subjects are not, for various reasons, capable of understanding the nature of the researcher's work or that (b) asking them to sign an informed consent form would be an ethically inopportune action (Marzano, 2012). The first situation is very frequent (how many of those who sign informed consent forms are truly aware of its consequences?) and in some cases glaring. An example is Lawton's research into hospices and the terminally ill (Lawton, 2001; see also Paterniti, 2000). This British researcher tried to keep patients coming to the hospice informed about the nature of her work but she could only rarely be sure that they had fully understood, given the late stage of their illness and their frequent dementia. The second situation is a matter of those social contexts in which signing a consent form (even simply informed consent) is bound up with painful memories and has exploitation and domination associations. This is the case of the waste pickers studied by Perez (2019, see also Gubrium et al., 2014, p. 1609). Perez herself has spoken of preferring, at many stages in her career, to use covert methods including to avoid offending the people she was observing. For example, despite fearing that they would forget, she did not remind the waste pickers she spent the day with what she had told them at the outset, that is, that she was recording them. Doing so would,

she believed, have been ethically 'required' but it might have meant implying that their mental faculties were in some way lacking and so ethically compromised. This could be a very serious accusation for people subjected to stigmatisation and social disparagement on a daily basis which they refuted by reminding others, including the ethnographer, of their qualifications.

Autoethnography and Online Research: Two Research Methodologies That Are Difficult to Reconcile with Overt Research

There are also new forms of research which have become very popular over recent years and are difficult to reconcile with informed consent and conventional codes of ethics. These are autoethnography (Ellis, 2004; Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2016) and online research (Calvey, 2017; Hennell, Limmer, & Piacentini, 2020). In autoethnography, scholars recount events from their own lives in detail and then critically analyse them. Clearly the narrator is never the only character in such texts, as is generally true of autobiographies, with other people being mentioned and their actions described. It is equally clear that this takes place without the prior consent of these latter. The facts described have already happened and frequently the people spoken of are no longer there or no longer in contact with the ethnographer. The cyberethnography situation is similar, namely ethnographic study of online material. Whilst it is theoretically possible to envisage researchers informing subjects of their presence in many situations, there is no doubt that online work exponentially increases the potential for 'lurking', namely doing very easy covert research into what happens on a certain site or social media page without intervening (and thus revealing one's true purpose) (Calvey, 2017). This is particularly true in the case of studies of social media (Woodfield, 2017) in which many of the ethical issues examined in relation to 'research in public places' arise (Iphofen, 2011).

The Risk of Causing Harm with Qualitative Research Is Very Limited

If we reread the history of ethnographic research objectively, we are obliged to accept that the harm done to the subjects of covert ethnographic research, including the most controversial, has been negligible to non-existent. Take the most controversial of all covert ethnography, the one universally cited as a negative example by all the critics of this method, Laud Humphrey's *Tearoom Trade*, a covert study of casual homosexual sex in public toilets in the second half of the 1960s. Even this much criticised research has been seen to have caused no harm to those Humphrey (1975) observed and then interviewed. Quite the contrary, it contributed to increasing tolerance of gay people in America and to bringing an end to repressive policies (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2018). The most significant risks were those its author himself, who later became a well-known activist in the defence of the civil rights of homosexuals, took in order to carry it out (Galliher, Brekhus, & Keys, 2004). And in some ways a similar argument, though on a smaller scale, can be made as regards Wacquant's (2004) book on boxers in an African-American ghetto in Chicago.

Covert Research Must Always Be Considered as a Kind of Last Resort

From a moderate perspective, scholars never opt for covert research without giving it serious thought. Quite the opposite, they make recourse to it only when strictly necessary, sometimes uneasily and with feelings of guilt and in any case always preferring to come out into the open and reveal their identities as soon as possible. For example, Virtová, Stöckelová, and Krásná (2018) have recounted that the member of the group who undertook the field work got herself hired at the electronic goods factory chosen for the study and kept her identity concealed in order to be able to carry out her research work freely without interference by the firm's management. As time went on, however, the moral urge to drop her mask and tell her worker colleagues the truth intensified and, after revealing her identity to some of her department colleagues, she went as far as to allow one of them, who had in the meantime become a close friend, to have a say on research strategy, decide who could be told the truth and which parts of the research needed to be terminated or rewritten. A similar decision was taken by Perez (2019) and myself, years ago and in similar terms, described the moral quandary which led to me seeking out and finding a way to do overt research (Marzano, 2007).

The Superiority of Situated Ethics

In summary, the exponents of what I have called a moderate form of covert research espouse a situated ethics (Calvey, 2008) in which they conceal their research identities only in certain situations and with specific limits and constraints ensuring full moral responsibility for their actions. In the view of its exponents, situated ethics and a sense of 'positionality' supply those involved in its research with much wider, more authentic and incisive protection than that given by mere informed consent, that is, a process which is frequently solely formal and defensive in purpose (regarding the reputation of the researcher or the academic institution he or she belongs to).

THE RADICAL APPROACH

The approach to covert research I have termed moderate or reformist has certainly been the most popular approach over the last two decades and it has, to some extent, rehabilitated this approach. That said, I cannot avoid citing here, however summarily, what I see as a more radical approach to covert research. It starts from the assumption that knowledge of the truth is a complicated business which requires getting over the defensive barriers put up by subjects to stop the truth coming out (Mitchell, 1993). In this context, covert research is seen as an absolute necessity and the sharing of information and research projects between scholars and subjects dangerously utopian. This perspective sees the research world as marked by conflict and the juxtaposition of interests with those observed on one side and researchers on the other.

This decidedly minority view is rare today and its great prophet is Jack Douglas, a very original theoretician and passionate researcher (Johnson, 2015). The book

in which he set out his 'research philosophy' most clearly (Douglas, 1976) begins with this striking phrase: 'The goal of all social research is to discover, understand and communicate truth about human beings in society'. Douglas is certainly well aware that this affirmation is replete with problems, heuristic complications and huge epistemological and methodological difficulties, believing that it must be considered the starting point for all knowledge acquisition all the same. Naturally the truth Douglas spoke of is not the absolute truth of the positivists but the everyday life truth we all seek out in our lives. For Douglas, in seeking out the truth, sociologists have no option but to prioritise one source in particular in their everyday lives and academic work equally, namely direct experience, first person participation, getting into the shoes, at least for a whilst, of a member of the social group or organisation to be studied. What can be gleaned from interviews comes second, as the direct experience of other people, with what can be deduced from mere logic or common sense coming last. The reason behind this research methods 'hierarchy' is to be sought in the fact that nothing is more reliable than direct experience. In interviews, there is always the chance that interviewees are lying or, at least, concealing part of the truth and the likelihood of this increases on certain themes (primarily sex, money and power) and above all in a society as divided and conflicted as contemporary America.

Douglas does not deny that there are research situations and contexts in which scholars can proceed by means of relationships of trust with the people they study and base their studies on the willingness of the latter to co-operate with them. There are, however, according to Douglas, others, and they are certainly not few in number, in which finding out the truth requires adopting a different research strategy, namely lying, acting under false pretences and infiltrating. I have already referred to the basic reasons behind this: the people sociologists often study are likely to lie and deceive often, they resist with all their power, and frequently in an organised way, any attempt by researchers to penetrate their worlds to get to know and describe them. And this is not only the case of criminals but also of the most normal of people, of us all, when things we prefer to keep hidden are involved. The perimeter of lies, deceit and half-truths is, for Douglas, so wide in social life that giving up covert methods would mean giving up casting light on the lion's share of human activities and thwart the knowledge gathering mission of the social sciences, relegating these to innocuous and moralistic disciplines.

It would, however, be mistaken to deduce an overall indifference to research ethics from the orientation of Douglas's research. In my view, and Douglas might perhaps agree, it would be closer to the truth to argue that the ethical principles his work is inspired by are not those of the currently prevalent code of ethics approach but rather inspired by the need to prioritise 'parrhesia' wherever possible, namely telling the truth, above all to the powerful, who don't want to hear it (Alvesalo-Kuusi & Whyte, 2018, Galliher, 1979). Parrhesia, as Michel Foucault (1983, 2011, 2012) reminded us in a reworking of ancient philosophy, is in some cases a courageous gesture (exposing the researcher to the anger and revenge of the powerful) and, in others, a gesture of friendship and brotherhood. In other words, telling the truth may serve to condemn an abuse but also to help a friend to take stock of reality. This is what Douglas (1976, p. 115) is implicitly reminding

us when he argues that investigative research also means stating, or rather putting into writing, a truth which might wound some of those in the field who have become friends, people we sympathise with but who we have done research on and who, when the results are written up, we must treat like all the others, no concessions. For Douglas (1976 p. 115), truth tellers are duty bound to report

illegal, shady or deviant activities (from the standpoint of the middle-class public) which the member would prefer were not reported, which could be used against the members by political enemies, and which the authors might prefer did not exist.

Truth tellers stop before nothing in their desire to tell the truth. In his book, Douglas describes frankly and in detail the academic world's many hypocrisies and lies and also sets out in full the many lies he himself has told in his private life. For Douglas ethics is not a bureaucratic issue which can be relegated to a board or protocol, but a profound moral duty bound up with telling the truth, whatever the cost and always. For him, the institutionalisation of the professional behavioural codes from which sanctions could be applied are a threat to freedom and constitute a tool by which to impose grey, depressing conformity and thus avert the emergence of new ideas which might jeopardise consolidated power balances (Douglas, 1979). The laws of liberal democratic states are more than sufficient to safeguard research ethics without the need for sanctions from specific ethics boards.

Douglas's very unusual approach has prompted bitter criticism by some, but also admiration and applause from others who have, however, only rarely emulated his approach to investigative research. Of these latter, many of his students can certainly be cited (Adler, 1993; Adler & Adler, 1987; Johnson, 1975, 2015; Melnikov & Kotarba, 2017, 2020), as well as certain contemporary authors whose approach is very close to the 'critical sociology' approach (Brannan, 2015, 2017; Lloyd, 2020; Sugden & Tomlinson, 1999), a formidable highly *sui generis* anthropologist like Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2004) and, above all, some of the greatest researchers in the history of ethnography from Dalton of *Men Who Manage*, (cited more than once by Douglas himself as a sublime example of investigative research), Rosenhan of *Being Sane in Insane Places*, Festinger of *When Prophecy Fails* and Goffman of *Asylums* (see also Mitchell, 1993).

CONCLUSIONS

Covert research was, for decades, a method made use of by social scientists without especial difficulty, feelings of guilt or inadequacy or negative implications for those studied. The change in cultural climate which took place in the 1980s and its newly introduced ethics standards has made covert research increasingly difficult, and frequently impossible when monitoring by ethics committees is required. However, covert research has not died out and many of the researchers adopting it (those I have called moderate or reformist) have done so in an attempt to demonstrate its compatibility with the generally accepted principles of ethics regulation. Outside this perimeter, a covert research tradition (which I have called radical) which is incompatible with codes of ethics but not with the

ethical principles involved in social research has struggled, all the same, to survive on the strength of those uncomfortable truths which many do not want to hear.

NOTES

1. Much of the epic social sciences research of the past was covert, with a few examples being Dalton (1959), Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter (1956), Goffman (1961) and Rosenhan (1973). For a complete list see Calvey (2017).
2. This has been analysed fully in the works cited at the beginning of this chapter.
3. Incidentally things are not simple even here, given the fact that, as Spicker, (2011) has noted, it is not solely public action which takes place in public places but also private actions which should be observed and reported with greater caution by social scientists.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A. (1993). *Wheeling and dealing: An ethnography of an upper-level drug dealing and smuggling community*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). *Membership roles in field research* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesalo-Kuusi, A., & Whyte, D. (2018). Researching the powerful: A call for the reconstruction of research ethics. *Sociological Research Online*, 23(1), 136–152.
- Atkinson, P. (2015). For Ethnography. London: Sage.
- Barnes, J. A. (1963). Some ethical problems in modern fieldwork. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 14(2), 118–134.
- Brannan, M. J. (2015). ‘You’re not going anywhere’: Employee retention, symbolic violence and the structuring of subordination in a UK-based call centre. *The Sociological Review*, 63(4), 801–819.
- Brannan, M. J. (2017). Power, corruption and lies: Mis-selling and the production of culture in financial services. *Human Relations*, 70(6), 641–667.
- Calvey, D. (2008). The art and politics of covert research: doing situated ethics’ in the field. *Sociology*, 42(5), 905–918.
- Calvey, D. (2017). *Covert research: The art, politics and ethics of undercover fieldwork*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Calvey, D. (2019). The everyday world of bouncers: A rehabilitated role for covert ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 19(3), 247–262.
- Christians, C. G. (2000). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 133–155). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dalton, M. (1959). *Men who manage. Fusions of feeling and theory in administration [With a chart]*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretative ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative social research: Individual and team field research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, J. D. (1979). Living morality versus bureaucratic fiat. In C. B. Klockars & F. W. O’Connor (Eds.), *Deviance and decency: The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects* (pp. 13–33).
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Rowman Altamira.
- Erikson, K. T. (1966). A comment on disguised observation in sociology. *Social Problems*, 14, 366–373.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When prophecy fails: A social and psychological study of a modern group that predicted the destruction of the world*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fine, G. A. (1993). Ten lies of ethnography: Moral dilemmas of field research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(3), 267–294.

- Fine, G. A., & Shulman, D. (2009). Lies from the field: Ethical issues in organizational ethnography. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels, & F. H. Kamsteeg, (Eds.), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 177–195). London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1983). *Discourse and truth: The problematization of Parrhesia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Foucault, M. (2011). *The government of self and others: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1982–1983*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2012). In F. Gros (Ed.), *The courage of truth (The government of self and others II): Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984*. New York, NY: Macmillan-Picador. C.
- Gallihier, J. F. (1979). Social Scientists' Ethical Responsibilities to Superordinates: Looking Upward Meekly. *Social Problems*, 27(3), 298–308
- Gallihier, J. F., Brekhus, W., & Keys, D. P. (2004). *Laud Humphreys: Prophet of homosexuality and sociology*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, A. C., Hill, A. L., & Flicker, S. (2014). A situated practice of ethics for participatory visual and digital methods in public health research and practice: A focus on digital storytelling. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(9), 1606–1614.
- Hammersley, M. (2020). Ethics of ethnography. In R. Iphofen (Ed.), *Handbook of research ethics and scientific integrity* (pp. 445–457). Cham: Springer.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Practices and principles*. East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Hedgecoe, A. (2016). Reputational risk, academic freedom and research ethics review. *Sociology*, 50(3), 486–501.
- Hennell, K., Limmer, M., & Piacentini, M. (2020). Ethical dilemmas using social media in qualitative social research: A case study of online participant observation. *Sociological Research Online*, 25(3), 473–489.
- Herrera, C. D. (1999). Two arguments for 'covert methods' in social research. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50(2), 331–343.
- Homan, R. (1980). The ethics of covert methods. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 33(1), 46–59.
- Humphreys, L. (1975). *Tearoom trade, enlarged edition: Impersonal sex in public places*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Iphofen, R. (2011). *Ethical decision making in social research: A practical guide*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Johnson, J. M. (1975). *Doing field research*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Johnson, J. M. (2015). Freedom works! The vision and broken heart of Jack D. Douglas. *Symbolic Interaction*, 38(2), 285–297.
- Jones, S. H., Adams, T. E., & Ellis, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of autoethnography*. London: Routledge.
- Lawton, J. (2001). Gaining and maintaining consent: ethical concerns raised in a study of dying patients. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(5), 693–705.
- Lloyd, A. (2020). Efficiency, productivity and targets: The gap between ideology and reality in the call centre. *Critical Sociology*, 46(1), 83–96.
- Lugosi, P. (2006). Between overt and covert research: Concealment and disclosure in an ethnographic study of commercial hospitality. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(3), 541–561.
- Marzano, M. (2004). Scene finali. In *Morire di cancro in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Marzano, M. (2007). Informed consent, deception, and research freedom in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(3), 417–436.
- Marzano, M. (2012). Informed consent. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft*. (pp. 443–445). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Marzano, M. (2018). The ethics of covert ethnographic research. In C. I. Macleod, J. Marx, P. Mnyaka & G. J. Treharne (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of ethics in critical research* (pp. 399–413). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

- McKenzie, J. S. (2009). 'You don't know how lucky you are to be here!': Reflections on covert practices in an overt participant observation study. *Sociological Research Online*, 14(2), 60–69.
- Melnikov, A., & Kotarba, J. A. (2017). Jack D. Douglas. In M. H. Jacobsen (Ed.). *The interactionist imagination* (pp. 291–314). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Melnikov, A., & Kotarba, J. A. (2020). *Douglas, Jack D.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Mitchell, R. G. (1993). *Secrecy and fieldwork* (Vol. 29). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social science & medicine*, 65(11), 2223–2234.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Paterniti, D. A. (2000). The micropolitics of identity in adverse circumstance: A study of identity making in a total institution. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 29(1), 93–119.
- Perez, T. S. (2019). In support of situated ethics: Ways of building trust with stigmatised 'waste pickers' in Cape Town. *Qualitative Research*, 19(2), 148–163.
- Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). On being sane in insane places. *Science*, 179(4070), 250–258.
- Roulet, T. J., Gill, M. J., Stenger, S., & Gill, D. J. (2017). Reconsidering the value of covert research: The role of ambiguous consent in participant observation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(3), 487–517.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (2004). Parts unknown: Undercover ethnography of the organs-trafficking underworld. *Ethnography*, 5(1), 29–73.
- Shils, E. (1982). Social inquiry and the autonomy of the individual. In M. Bulmer (Ed.), *Social research ethics: An examination of the merits of covert participant observation* (pp. 125–141). London: Macmillan.
- Spicker, P. (2011). Ethical covert research. *Sociology*, 45(1), 118–133.
- Sugden, J., & Tomlinson, A. (1999). Digging the dirt and staying clean: Retrieving the investigative tradition for a critical sociology of sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 34(4), 385–397.
- Traianou, A., & Hammersley, M. (2020). Is there a right not to be researched? Is there a right to do research? Some questions about informed consent and the principle of autonomy. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24(4), 443–452.
- Van den Hoonaard, W. (2011). *The seduction of ethics: Transforming the social sciences*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Virtová, T., Stöckelová, T., & Krásná, H. (2018). On the track of c/overt research: Lessons from taking ethnographic ethics to the extreme. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(7) 453–463.
- Wacquant, L. J. (2004). *Body & soul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Warwick, D. P. (1982). Tearoom trade: Means and end in social research. In M. Bulmer (Ed.), *Social research ethics: An examination of the merits of covert participant observation* (pp. 38–58). London: Macmillan
- Wiles, R., Crow, G., Charles, V., & Heath, S. (2007). Informed consent and the research process: following rules or striking balances?. *Sociological Research Online*, 12(2), 99–110.
- Woodfield, K. (2017). *The ethics of online research (Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Vol. 2)*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2018). Framing "deception" and "covertiness" in research: Do Milgram, Humphreys, and Zimbardo justify regulating social science research ethics?. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 19(3). Retrieved from <https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/3102/4274>