Within societies that are ethnically and culturally diverse, almost any study that involves children and families needs to attend to culture and ethnicity. Specific ethics considerations arise in addressing ethnicity—whether a study encompasses diverse ethnic, religious or cultural groups, or only involves a single ethnic group (including majority ethnic groups such as “white British”). These considerations apply whether or not ethnicity is a key focus of the research. This chapter will address the ethics tensions involved in conducting research within ethnically and culturally diverse societies. I will begin by drawing on the example of the UK context, considering the patterns of ethnic diversity within its population. Following a discussion of contexts, I turn to
concepts, to consider how understandings of ethnicity can inform reflection, and practical strategies, for working with ethics across the research process.

ATTENDING TO ETHNICITY IN STUDIES WITHIN COUNTRIES

There is a substantial academic literature on ethics in research with children and young people in low income or economically developing countries (e.g. Young and Barrett, 2001; Molyneux, Peshu and Marsh, 2005; McGregor, 2006; Harper, 2007; Morrow, 2009), along with ethics guidance on this topic from learned societies and research funders. For example, The Wellcome Trust, a major UK funder, provides detailed online guidance on research with people in low or middle income countries, emphasising the need to be aware of special cultural and social considerations, and to recognise that the concept of research may not be readily understood by participants, or may be confused with direct service provision. Such considerations are relevant to research within affluent countries too, but it is less common for ethics guidance explicitly to address culture, religion and ethnicity in within-country research. To take one example, in the UK in 2010, the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) published its revised Framework for Research Ethics. This document highlights cultural considerations in research conducted outside the UK, but does not specifically
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1 See for example, the Association of Social Anthropologists: http://www.theasa.org/ethics.shtml or the Wellcome Trust: http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Policy-and-position-statements/WTD015295.htm (accessed 24 April 2011).

2 The main UK social science research funding body.
address the ethics of working across cultures in research located within the UK.

What does this mean for the ways in which researchers understand and negotiate ethics in research that spans ethnic, religious or cultural groups within a society? Arguably, studies that are purposely focused on studying specific ethnic, religious or cultural groups may more readily attend to these aspects of their populations than those which simply “happen” to span diverse groups, where this is not the main focus of the work. In within-country research, can ethnic and cultural sensitivity be assumed to be embedded within key ethics principles, such as those relating to informed consent and avoidance of harm? The ESRC Framework does advise that ethics committees should aim to be representative of ethnic diversity in the population, advice that is probably intended to ensure that the ethics considerations of work across cultural or ethnic groups are routinely addressed. However, the lack of explicit attention to these specific considerations could mean they are rendered invisible when considering the ethics of research that is not purposely focused on ethnicity, religion or culture.

CONCEPTUALISING ETHNICITY

It is common practice in social science to classify people according to concepts of “race”, ethnicity, skin colour, cultural origin or ancestry, or country of descent, but classification is not straightforward. Categories are not universally agreed upon; for example, there is considerable international variation in census questions on ethnicity and related topics (Simpson and Akinwale,
In the United Kingdom, for example, national census data has recorded “ethnic group” since 1991, with religion recorded since 2001. Ethnic group is self-assigned, chosen by the respondent from a list of 16 categories (including an “other” option) (Office of National Statistics, 2010). Aspinall (2009) argued that the UK census categories for classifying ethnicity began with a concern to redress discrimination based on colour, and this motivation is reflected in UK census categories (e.g. “white UK”). However, the picture is more complex that this statement suggests. Gunaratnam (2007) criticised an appetite for “technical fixes” that neglect the ethical and methodological complexities of classifying ethnicity, driven by a policy context which seeks to “simplify, objectify, and tame the meanings and effects of ethnicity and difference” (op. cit., p147).

Ethnic groupings are not fixed categories of difference, but are complex, dynamic and context-dependent. Equally, ethnicity encompasses multiple different aspects, and there is a need to acknowledge intersectionality: “the intersecting relations of social class, racialisation, ethnicisation and sexuality as well as gender” (Phoenix, 2009, p102). In studies of childhood, participants’ positioning and identity as children is a key additional intersecting factor. These conceptual complexities inevitably incur ethics considerations, which have been well discussed elsewhere (e.g., Gunaratnam, 2007; Morning, 2008). The purpose of this paper is to consider how researchers can best ensure ethical practice throughout the process of researching ethnically diverse populations, drawing on the example of research in the UK. First, it is useful to consider the nature and extent of ethnic diversity within
the UK, by drawing on UK census classifications and considering the complexity therein.

THE UK CONTEXT
National census data show that the UK is a diverse and changing society. The most recent available estimates for England and Wales show that 89 per cent of the population were categorised as “white”, with the remainder belonging to other groups. These data are in line with patterns for the UK as a whole, according to the most recent published census data (2001). White people continue to be the largest overall census grouping in the UK, but this group is itself diverse, encompassing those defining themselves as “white UK” and people amalgamated into an “other white” category, including the UK’s long-established white Irish population (which is declining), as well as “white other”. This last grouping is growing, partly as a result of migration from other EU countries, and it is now larger than any single minority ethnic group in the UK.

A further change is in the proportion of children of mixed parentage, which is the fastest-growing category of children in the UK: there are now more children aged under 15 years who have one white and one black Caribbean parent in the UK than who have two black Caribbean parents (Owen, 2005). However, populations are not evenly spread, and minority ethnic groups are more likely to live in urban areas. Perhaps not surprisingly,
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the London region is the most ethnically diverse: at the time of the 2001 census it was home to more than three-quarters of the country’s total black African population, as well as six out of ten of the black Caribbean population, half the Bangladeshi population, and one in three of the white Irish population (Forsyth and Gardener 2006).

**INTERSECTING ETHICS: ETHNICITY AND RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN**

The importance of attending to the intersectionality of ethnicity with other aspects of identity means taking account of participants’ position and identity as children, as well as their ethnicity or culture. The ethics principles that have been derived for research with adults—such as ensuring freely given fully informed consent, and the right to withdraw from research participation—apply equally to children. However, Morrow (2008) noted four additional provisos that apply more specifically to research involving children:

- children’s competencies, perceptions and frameworks of reference, which may differ according to factors including—but not limited to—their age, and which are different from those of adults;
- children’s potential vulnerability to exploitation in interaction with adults, and adults’ specific responsibilities towards children;
- the differential power relationships between adult researcher and child participant; and
• the role of adult gatekeepers in mediating access to children, with concomitant ethical implications in relation to informed consent.

In the UK, children under the age of 18 years are legally minors, but there is no explicit requirement in law for adult consent to children’s participation in research. Nonetheless, legal frameworks such as the Fraser Guidelines, based on the Gillick Ruling (Gillick [1985] 3 All ER 423)—which are intended for clinical treatment, and not for research—often inform understandings of requirements for adult consent to child participation (Boddy and Oliver, 2010). As Alderson (2007, p2273) observed, such debates about minors’ consent can appear to be “less concerned with children’s rights than with adults’ freedoms”.

These provisos may have different implications across ethnic or cultural groups—for example, they may depend on culturally located constructions of children’s autonomy. Morrow’s reminder of the role of adult gatekeepers raises an additional consideration: children live within families, and there is a need to ensure ethical practice towards parents (or other responsible adults) as well as children.

INTERSECTING ETHICS: NORMALISED ABSENCE AND PATHOLOGISED PRESENCE
Phoenix (e.g., 1987; Phoenix and Husain 2007) has written of the “normalised absence/pathologised presence” of ethnicity in research with children and families, observing that
[m]inority ethnic families are ignored when normalised, unproblematic issues are being studied, but are focused on when issues seen as problematic are being examined. In addition, differences are frequently interpreted as deficiencies or deviations from the norm by minority ethnic parents and children. (Phoenix and Husain 2007, p. 8)

At heart, these are ethics considerations. The concept of normalised absence indicates a need to ensure that research in ethnically diverse societies includes the voices of participants from minority ethnic groups. Minority ethnic groups tend to be under-represented in research, to the extent that national representative studies such as the UK Millennium Cohort Study over-sample minority ethnic groups, to address lower response rates and higher attrition rates, compared to the sample as a whole (Plewis 2007). Failure to attend to potential barriers to participation—such as language or literacy, or understandings of research—may act to silence minority ethnic voices, and hence maintain the status quo by normalising (and so privileging) majority ethnic perspectives. This last point raises an interesting question about the purpose of research ethics, and the extent to which the right to participation (and hence an inclusive research design) is seen as ethically important.

There is a well-established tension in discussions of research ethics—especially when concerning children—between protection and participation (e.g. Alderson, 2007; Boddy and Oliver, 2010; Powell et al., 2011). As Maguire (2005) argued, these are questions of “who gets to speak after all and whose voices are heard, recognised, or silenced”—questions of normalised absence
of some children’s voices. However, Powell and colleagues (2011) rightly argue that there is no essential conflict between children’s right to be protected and their right to have a voice; rather it is a question of balance. A similar balance might be found in applying the principle of freely given consent, which can be seen to refer to the individual’s right to choose whether or not to take part. Protective ethics discourses emphasise the individual right to refuse to participate, or to withdraw from research. Within a participatory ethics framework, it might instead be argued that when a research design acts to exclude certain groups, informed consent is undermined because some potential participants lose the freedom to make the choice to agree to take part.

This literature suggests that the risks of normalised absence are multiplied for children from minority ethnic groups, when over-protective discourses of childhood coincide with the tendency to exclude or under-represent minority ethnic perspectives in within-country research. When working in societies with ethnically or culturally diverse populations, this perspective implies that researchers have a particular ethical responsibility to ensure the accessibility of their research to children from minority ethnic groups.

The concept of pathologised presence is an ethics concern because research should avoid harm—in this case, the harm of stigma or prejudice for children and families from minority ethnic groups. Phoenix and Husain (2007) commented on the tendency for research involving majority ethnic and minority ethnic groups to treat the majority ethnic group as the norm against which other families are (often unfavourably) compared.
Such comparisons are additionally problematic because of the intersection of ethnicity with other factors. Family structures differ across ethnic groups, with concomitant implications for normative understandings of “family” (Ribbens McCarthy and Edwards, 2011). In the 2001 UK census, for example, there were higher rates of lone parenthood among families categorised as black or black British or as of African-Caribbean and white mixed parentage than in the rest of the population (Connolly and Raha, 2006).

A key structural variable in this context is socio-economic disadvantage. The UK has substantially higher levels of child poverty among minority ethnic groups than in the white British majority ethnic population, with rates of poverty almost three times higher for Pakistani and Bangladeshi children than for their white British peers (Platt, 2009). Lone parenthood also intersects with child poverty: Maplethorpe and colleagues’ (2010) survey of almost 6,000 families reported that lone parents were seven times more likely to have a total family income in the lowest quintile. At the same time, support systems designed to ameliorate disadvantage—such as parenting support services—are often less accessible to families from minority ethnic groups (e.g. Butt, 2009). In the context of the present discussion, such structural inequalities have ethical implications because there is a risk of misattribution of causal factors—such that ethnicity is seen as the disadvantaging factor for children and families, rather than underlying variables such as poverty or inaccessibility of services.

There may also be a lack of cultural understanding in interpreting differences between groups. Phoenix and Husain (2007)
highlight the risk of culturally biased analysis when researchers from one cultural group study members of another group. They cite research by Gonzales and colleagues (1996; in Phoenix and Husain 2007) on Baumrind’s (e.g. 1991) concept of parenting “style” (a concept rooted in research with white middle class American families). This work showed that researchers from different ethnic groups interpreted parenting practices differently: “out-group” observers made more critical judgements than “in-group” observers. This example indicates that—just as with international cross-cultural research—research across cultures within countries requires culturally sensitive analysis that takes account of intersections with structural variables such as poverty and local context.

This body of work indicates the value of the linked concepts of normalised absence and pathologised presence as a conceptual frame for reflection on the ethics of research with children and families within ethnically or culturally diverse societies. Those considerations span the research process, from the formulation of research questions to the dissemination of research findings.

ETHICS IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS: FROM DEFINING RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO ANALYSIS AND REPORTING
The ethics of defining research questions and of analysis and reporting can be considered together here, because the way that a research question is defined is closely linked to the potential use of research—and so to the risk of harm (for example, through stigmatisation, or neglect of minority ethnic perspectives).
Classificatory systems of ethnicity and related topics are inevitably defined within local and national contexts (Morning, 2008), and thus are “ethically and politically dangerous” (Gunaratnam, 2007, p. 152). Aspinall (2009, p. 1418) discusses growing UK interest in migration from EU new accession countries, suggesting that

[t]he traditional agenda of identifying groups to redress discrimination and injustices remains. Yet unprecedentedly high levels of migration to the country since the mid-1990s by asylum-seekers and economic migrants from EU new accession countries—and the consequent pressures on housing and other services—have led to a focus by government on the question of what is a sustainable level of in-migration and on the broader issues of social cohesion and integration.

Aspinall’s interpretation of the causal link between migration and government concern is itself not politically neutral. It provides an example, here, of the potential for research which addresses (or which fails adequately to address) ethnic groupings to influence media or political debates—the potential to position migration or minority ethnicity as problematic, and add fuel to debates about integration or assimilation. In defining research questions and in analysing and reporting results, there is need to reflect on the following:

- What is the rationale for the research? In whose interest are the questions being asked? What is the funder’s agenda in commissioning the project? How could the findings be used by other people?
• Are the research questions neutral or could they give rise to stigmatisation of any groups?
• Do the research questions make any assumptions about any particular groups? Do they account for the intersections between ethnicity and other aspects of identity (such as age or gender) and for cultural and religious contexts?
• Do analysis and reporting take account of participants’ own perspectives on their experiences, or do they privilege the researcher’s analytic concerns?
• Does reporting address positives as well as negatives?

The nature of social science research means that we are often concerned with researching difficulties or potentially vulnerable groups, and—unless we reflect—this can mean that analysis and reporting can position participants as problematic.

RESEARCH TEAMS
The composition of the research team is not usually seen as an ethical concern, beyond a need to ensure team members’ competence. But in research which crosses ethnic, linguistic or cultural boundaries, there are particular questions that need to be addressed.

Risks of cultural bias can be addressed, at least in part, through the construction of the research team, by recruiting researchers who are members of the ethnic, cultural or religious groups being studied. This may not always be easy to achieve, depending on the availability of candidates from those groups who meet other criteria for recruitment (e.g. in terms of
academic qualifications and research experience). At the same time, recruitment could be exploitative of the staff concerned, if the employment of minority ethnic researchers is used to give credence to a problematising analytic position. A further complicating factor stems from the intersection of ethnicity with education and social class: from a participant’s perspective, the professional status of the researcher (or interpreter) may be intimidating or stigmatising, regardless of his or her ethnicity. Borchgrevnik (2003) gave an example of this in international ethnographic research, noting that low-caste participants could be reluctant to speak to high-caste interpreters. Considerations such as caste and status are no less relevant when conducting social research in any diverse society.

The extent of ethnic diversity in urban centres such as London means that it may not be feasible for a research team’s composition to reflect the study population. To take an example from my own experience, in 2005 my colleagues and I conducted a study in one London local authority, which involved interviews with 60 randomly sampled parents who used local early childhood services (Wigfall, Boddy and McQuail, 2007). Including English, 16 different languages were spoken in the homes of parents interviewed. Within the timescale and available budget for this small study, it would have been impossible to recruit a research team that included this diversity.

So what can be done? There are two considerations here. First, it is necessary to reflect on the risk of cultural bias. In some cases, it will be appropriate for a research team to be recruited with regard to the ethnicity of the study population—especially
when the study is concerned with understanding the experience of particular ethnic groups, or is likely to include a significant proportion of participants from certain groups. But any study can also be informed through consultation with members of the groups being researched—for example, through iterative piloting, or with the support of expert stakeholders, or an advisory group. In the study described above, we consulted with local service managers and workers from local minority ethnic populations to ensure we began our research with an appropriate understanding. We also took advice about the employment of interpreters, and local workers who spoke community languages explained the research and sought initial consent for us to make contact with families. This emphasis on inclusive strategies helped the research as a whole, by ensuring diversity of the study sample and perspectives.

By anticipating the likely characteristics of the sample (in terms of language and ethnicity) when designing a project, it should be possible to work out how best to approach the construction of the team. Key questions to consider include the following:

- Can you recruit researchers who are members of the minority ethnic groups you are studying? If not, how will you address cultural and linguistic understanding?
- How will you ensure the competence of any associated staff you use—such as interpreters? How will you address intersecting issues such as status, to ensure that staff are not intimidating or condescending of those they perceive to be of lower status?
• How will you ensure that all those involved in the research have adequate training, and understand the purpose and nature of your research, as well as requirements for confidentiality?

RESEARCH LANGUAGES
Language can be a critical barrier to participation for participants who are immigrants to the study country, and can undermine freely given informed consent. In research with children, this raises a particular issue about the relative position of children and their parents in giving permission. Children who attend school are likely to speak the majority language of their country (English in the UK), even if this is not their home language, but their parents may not. What does this mean for the common protocol, in research with children, of seeking a responsible adult’s permission before approaching a child for consent? Might the adult role in the consent process be eroded when the parent/carer does not speak English? Might children from some minority ethnic groups be excluded from research because consent procedures are not accessible to non-English speaking parents? Is it appropriate for children to broker adult permission for research? Orellana and colleagues’ (e.g. 2003) research on language brokering by children highlights the complexity of the power relationships involved. They noted (p508) that “[y]outh ‘brokers’ or ‘advocates’ are not neutral, nor are they invested with great societal power: they are children speaking for adults and immigrants interfacing with ‘mainstream’ institutions and authority figures”.
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Whilst Orellana and colleagues note that children’s language brokering should not inevitably be seen as problematic, power differentials are also a critical characteristic of research with children (Morrow, 2008), and so their observations are very relevant here.

The need for language brokering by children can be avoided by producing information in languages spoken by potential participants (and their families). That approach incurs some financial costs for translation (and, ideally, back-translation), but more importantly, it is important to consider (a) the feasibility of this and (b) the form of information provision.

To take the example cited earlier, of our research in inner-London, the costs of producing information in 16 languages for a study of 60 families were prohibitive. Instead, an English information leaflet was prepared with a standard phrase (“If you would like this information in Language X, please call...”) translated into the four most common community languages. This is a common strategy because it is less costly than full translation, but it is potentially problematic and needs some thought. For example:

• Who will answer the phone? What will happen if the call comes through to an English speaking researcher who does not know enough of the community language to access appropriate interpreting?
• What will happen if the call is directed to someone with appropriate language skills outside the research team? You will need to ensure they understand and
follow your protocols in terms of (for example) freely
given and fully informed consent and confidentiality.

- Regardless of who deals with the telephone call, there
  is still a problem in that participants who speak other
  languages do not have accessible information that they
can keep after contact with the researcher has ended.

Even if there is funding for translation, written information may
not be appropriate for potential participants. It is necessary to
consider language and literacy, and also dialect or local langua-
ges. For example, many Bangladeshi communities in London
speak Sylheti, not Bengali. Sylheti does not have a written script,
and Sylheti speakers may not read Bengali. In research with a
Sylheti community, it may be of little use to translate an infor-
mation sheet into Bengali. It might be more useful to provide
a CD or DVD, which gives the study information verbally, and
which participants can keep.

This discussion has focused on information provision, but
the need to consider research languages goes further. Studies
often rely on written literacy in the majority language for data
collection—for example, in completion of questionnaires. Such
methods can function to exclude participants who cannot read,
or write, the majority language. In designing research, it is impor-
tant to consider whether that approach (and the subsequent
exclusion of some minority perspectives) is necessary and jus-
tifiable, or whether the design is based on cost or convenience.
Even when studies do rely on written measures, it may still be
possible to supplement the research design so that participants
without written literacy in the majority language can complete measures verbally—either by translation into common minority languages, or by verbal completion of measures with the support of an interpreter if necessary.

**SAMPLING**

Providing accessible information is a key first step in avoiding the invisibility of multi-cultural perspectives in within country research. Following on through the research process, there are questions about how the sample itself is defined. Here, we turn to a pressing debate in the ethics of research design—that of “opt-in” or “opt-out” consent.

Opt-out samples are those where participants are contacted without volunteering to take part in the research—and excluded only when they say they are unwilling to participate. This approach is seen as problematic by many ethics committees because it undermines the principle that consent should be *freely given*. For example, the fourth principle in the ESRC Framework for Research Ethics (2010, p3) states that “[r]esearch participants must take part voluntarily, free from any coercion”.

With opt-out methods, participants may be included unless they actively say “no”. But people may find it difficult to say “no” to a researcher for a variety of reasons, and this may be a particular concern for participants from some minority ethnic groups. Morrow (2009, p5) observed that “[i]n many parts of the world, however, people do not necessarily have any experience or understanding of what research is”. She further notes that the assumption of the primacy of the individual in informed
consent is problematic in research with children, because they “are also seldom seen as completely separate persons, being always connected to parents or carers” (p5). Culturally located understandings of research, and of individual adult or child rights and freedoms, are equally relevant to research within a country such as the UK, because of the population’s diversity. Potential participants may have little understanding of research, or the concept of freely given individual consent, if they come from countries or communities which do not have a strong research culture, or which place little emphasis on individual rights (whether for political reasons or because of a relatively greater emphasis on kin and community than on the individual).

These observations indicate that opt-out sampling methods may be particularly problematic in terms of securing freely given consent from participants from some cultural groups. However, the key strength of opt-out sampling is that it is more inclusive than opt-in methods, which require participants actively to volunteer to take part. There is a range of evidence showing that opt-in samples are less representative than samples recruited by opt-out methods, and it is not surprising that sampling strategies which require active volunteering could inadvertently exclude people with less understanding of the potential value of research. Opt-in methods result in lower response rates, and have also been shown to bias samples towards populations with lower levels of material disadvantage. Hewison and Haines (2006), in a discussion of sample recruitment for medical research, argue that opt-in methods could act as a barrier to participation for some minority ethnic groups, giving rise to a failure to detect
differences in quality of care and outcome for these groups. This concern is pertinent to Phoenix’s (e.g. 1987) arguments about the normalised absence of minority ethnic perspectives.

There is a critical distinction here between the use of opt-out methods for approaching participants, and the subsequent process of seeking freely given and fully informed consent. Hewison and Haines (2006, p. 300) write that:

[Potential participants] may not consider, for example, a brief telephone call after a letter explaining the proposed research to be an unjustifiable invasion of their privacy if there seems to be a good reason for the call and their privacy is in all other respects protected. If, as seems likely, many people who do not respond to a request would not object to being approached by a researcher, an opt-in system may deprive them of the opportunity to participate in research [...] Indeed, some people might prefer an opt-out system because of the support and reassurance that personal contact can provide.

There are parallels between this argument and Morrow’s (2009) observation that consent is a process, not an event. In relation to the Young Lives study, involving 12,000 children in four economically developing countries, Morrow writes that participants’ understandings and agreement to participate are checked repeatedly during the research process, and methods of recording consent are flexible according to individual participants’ preferences and local contexts. This understanding of consent as a negotiated process has equal value in affluent or economically developed countries, not least in attending to issues of language,
literacy, and understandings of research. However, both opt-in and opt-out sampling methods raise potential ethics problems for the recruitment of ethnic minority participants: there is no single “best” approach. Rather, it is critical for the researcher to be aware of these issues, and how they apply to their work.

CONCLUSION
The discussion presented here indicates the need to address ethics throughout the research process, to anticipate what difficulties might arise, and how they can be addressed. Practical questions about the conduct of the research—from staff recruitment to preparation of information sheets—may appear prosaic, but they are necessary to develop concrete strategies by which to achieve an inclusive cross-cultural approach.

Preparation is key. At the stage of research planning, for example, there is a need to ensure sufficient funds for translation and interpreting so that non-majority language speakers are not excluded. In doing so, it is necessary to anticipate the potential needs of parents (or other adult gatekeepers) as well as children. Consideration of culture and ethnicity should also form part of training and discussions with project workers (including external staff such as interpreters), and researchers should consider how they might embed culturally specific expertise within the research team and/or in advisory roles. The extent to which all of this is feasible (and financially practicable in a straitened funding climate) depends on the scope and focus of the research. It is perhaps easier to justify such investment of time and financial resources when research is purposely focused
on studying culture, religion or ethnicity, even if diversity is not
the main focus of the work. When conducting research in diverse
societies, however, there is always an ethical imperative to engage
with diversity—to ensure rights to participation and protection.

The discussion presented here has, intentionally, raised more
questions than it has offered answers. That reflects a recognition
that research ethics must be situated in context, as a reflective
and dialogic process—a principle that applies to any research
study, but is especially pertinent to work with diverse groups.
There are few simple rules that should always be followed, and
few obvious right or wrong answers. In the words of a UK academ-
ic, interviewed by Boddy and Oliver (2010, p. 40): “We can stand
in lectures and discuss [ethics], but it is a bit muddy—you can’t
have absolutes. You couldn’t policy legislate for every scenario.”

The considerations discussed in this paper indicate a need
to “get muddy”—to make ethical tensions and ethnocentric
assumptions explicit throughout every stage and aspect of the
research process. Above all, this is worthwhile because reflexive
ethical practice will benefit the quality of research as a whole, by
addressing the normalised absence and pathologised presence of
minority childhood experiences within diverse societies.
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