**Week 2:**

Ethics:

1. Self-reflection: ask each person to write 5 things about themselves on post-it notes. Then divide students into groups of 3 and ask them to discuss their choices of words. Finally combine students into 3 groups of 6 and ask them to create ‘categories’ based on the words they use to describe themselves. The aim is to get students to look at how they are perceived and how they perceive others – being critically reflective during research

2. Read the following case study:

|  |
| --- |
| Laud Humphreys in 1966, recognized that the public and the law-enforcement authorities hold highly simplistic stereotyped beliefs about men who commit impersonal sexual acts with one another in public restrooms. "Tearoom sex," as sex in public restrooms is called, accounts for the majority of homosexual arrests in the United States. Humphreys decided that it would be of considerable social importance for society to gain more objective understanding of who these men are and what motivates them to seek quick, impersonal sexual gratification.For his Ph.D. dissertation at Washington University, Humphreys set out to answer this question by means of participant observation and structured interview. He stationed himself in "tearooms" and offered to serve as a "watchqueen" - the individual who keeps watch and coughs when a police car stops nearby or a stranger approaches. He played that role faithfully while observing hundreds of homosexual acts. He was able to gain the confidence of some of the men he observed, disclose his role as scientist, and persuade them to tell him about the rest of their lives and about their motives. Those who were willing to talk openly with him tended to be among the better-educated members of the "tearoom trade." To avoid bias, Humphreys secretly followed some of the other men he observed and recorded the license numbers of their cars. A year later and carefully disguised, Humphreys appeared at their homes claiming to be a health-service interviewer and interviewed them about their marital status, race, job, and so on. After the study, Humphreys destroyed the names and addresses of the men he had interviewed in order to protect their anonymity. His study was subsequently published as a major work on human sexual behaviour [Humphreys, L. (1970) Tearoom Trade: A Study of Homosexual Encounters in Public Places. London: Duckworth.] |

Humphreys' findings destroy many stereotypes, but there are also many concerns about how his study was conducted especially as it was before the time of ethical review boards.

Discussion question:

1. Was it unethical for Humphreys to observe men engaged in homosexual acts in the ‘tea room’? Does the fact that the behaviour occurred in a public place make a difference?
2. Was it ethical for Humphreys to seek the names and addresses of the men from the police based on the license plate numbers?
3. Upon completing the study should Humphreys have informed the men about his study and how they had been participants in it? Should we always return all research findings to participants?
4. Humphreys destroyed all the evidence he had for his research so how do we know he did not make the whole thing up? Can his research be replicated?
5. No obvious harm was done to the men who remained anonymous and Humphreys book has a major impact in the perception of homosexual behaviour. Does the ends justify the means then?

Positionality:

1. Power shuffle game: getting participants to move cross the room according to categories. Start with socioculturally defined, historically defined and then more general one. For example: American Born, Native English Speaker, Able bodied, White, SEG. What are the reactions?

2. Ask people to imagine certain social situations: a meeting, a lecture, a dinner party, a bus - ask them where they would choose to sit and why?