1

Ethical positioning in work-based investigations

Sue Callan with Linda Picken and Sue Foster

Chapter overview

This chapter discusses the respectful practices at the heart of early years provision. These echo established ethical guidelines relating to the conduct of professional enquiry by practitioners. We argue that the kind of work-based investigation most usually involved in leading and managing teams arises from day-to-day reflective practice, as experienced practitioners seek to continuously improve work with children and families. As a result, we present an exploration of ethics in the context of daily practice. We seek to show that the 'academic' preoccupation with formal processes outlined in Chapter 2 offers a useful framework for ensuring that 'real-world'/insider research is conducted in an appropriately professional manner. So, while we illustrate our discussion with pictures from undergraduate academic projects, we do so as part of the scheme of the text overall – to apply direct experience from practice in order to illustrate complex academic concepts. We reflect on our experience as experienced practitioners in England and the small-scale investigations that have enhanced our ability to make an impact on practice – including the awareness of decisions relating to leadership and conscious, ethical management of settings and people.

In the UK, the BERA (2004, online) guidelines are a recognised point of reference for informing ethical decisions about 'formal' research projects. The Scottish guidelines are featured in our end-of-chapter activities. While these apply to all major, funded research projects they are also a useful source for student researchers and practitioners wishing to adopt professional protocols, i.e. the things that everyone should do. Only Scandinavia and Australia have *laws* appertaining to ethical research. Early Childhood Australia's Code of Ethics (2010, online) reflects these statutory requirements and therefore highlights children's well-being as paramount and that 'research' includes routine documentation of learning and development. Similarly, we note here (but expand in Chapter 8) how our consideration of ethics in practice has been enhanced by the work of Cullen et al. (2009) in New Zealand. In a very accessible paper, Dockett et al. (2009) have shown how these principles can be effectively applied, supporting our view that ethical practice underpins pedagogy, leadership and management responsibility and influencing our selection of headings within this chapter. The Australian ethical code also requires 'researchers' to make informed decisions about the participation of all concerned based on a clear understanding of the *purpose* and value of the proposed investigation.

The chapter offers a practical application of these key themes for colleagues aiming to inform their leadership through critically reflective work-based investigation. It is helpful to consider 'ethics' as the basis of a 'contract' for working with others, which includes:

- professional conduct and management of 'informal' investigation;
- protection of participants from 'harm';
- inclusion and diversity;
- the challenges of working with the Internet.

The chapter focuses on identifying strategies for the planning and conduct of work-based enquiry and a clear framework for this is offered in Chapter 8 which is a 'sister' chapter developing the discussion of ethical practice as it relates to reflection on action. We hope that the framework will work just as well for 'formal' academic projects as the professional management of 'informal' investigations conducted as part of leadership actions.

General context

If you are an early childhood practitioner working with children and families, ethical responsibilities are at the very heart of your role. You will be familiar with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 (online) with the focus on privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. You will be well aware of the values and attitudes underpinning anti-discriminatory practice in the setting and for promoting inclusion. You will be leading and managing others to ensure that the welfare requirements of the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS, in England) (DCSF, 2008a) or relevant national frameworks are met with regard to child-centred practice and human rights legislation. These are all working examples of ethical management as discussed in Robins and Callan (2009).

In terms of the responsibility for implementing the EYFS (or national variation), your work will also be informed by personal and professional values which are reflected in the themes and principles underpinning early childhood policy objectives such as Every Child Matters (DfES, 2004). Canning (2009) discusses values-based leadership as it applies theory and philosophies of the early childhood tradition. A cycle of reflection (Appleby, 2010) will inform your practice overall – underpinned by commitment to the collaborative approaches expected of Early Years Professionals (EYP) in England (CWDC, 2009), and for all those leading practice in the four nations of the UK as illustrated in Chapter 4. Such an approach also needs to take heed of ethical guidelines in order to ensure that practice values are consistently applied. When we work with those closest to us (in 'insider' research), it is easy to assume that the quality of day-to-day relationships will carry through intuitively into such projects. To be an ethical manager and researcher continued vigilance is needed to ensure that such assumptions do not lead to oversight and misrepresentation of those involved. In short, ethical approaches mean that you will be aware of your position as researcher and how this affects the investigation. In daily practice, these ethical commitments, represent a way of 'being' just as the habit of reflection becomes a part of the professional qualities of experienced practitioners. We recommend the work of Newman and Pollnitz (2002) for their effective visual representation of this way of 'being' and much of this chapter is represented in their 'ethical response cycle'. Similarly, Alderson and Morrow (2011) discuss the role and position of the researcher, with additional material on assessing harm and benefits to participants.

Professional propriety – planning and managing a process

The work-based investigations featured in this chapter were undertaken as a personal, professional enquiry into the development of practice by experienced practitioners engaged in academic professional development. However, each was centred on a perceived ‘problem’ for practice in the workplace – with the purpose of understanding and resolving challenges to facilitate positive change. As such the examples are characteristic of the informal investigations common in settings. In this first picture from practice, Linda shows how ethical issues informed her initial plan of action in embracing change for the setting.

> For my work-based investigation I chose to re-examine my interpretation of the Reggio Emilia approach to learning. My concern for practice was that we had adopted the philosophies and values from Reggio as the result of research and … I wanted to be assured that our principles could work successfully with the EYFS framework (DCSF, 2008a). I planned to read and update myself in terms of literature concerning the early years curriculum frameworks, but I also identified how I was going to share this opportunity for reflection in our ‘community’. I aimed to hold focus group sessions with practitioners within my setting. The views of the parents also held significant value and I wanted the children to be given the opportunity to voice their views. In order to do this, I sought permission from the Centre management group to proceed and then permission from every practitioner willing to help. I had to inform every one verbally of my intentions, and then issue a consent letter to those practitioners who expressed a willingness to contribute. The same principle of choice applied to the parents. To safeguard the children I needed parental permission – I sent out a letter seeking permission and explaining how I would ensure anonymity for all participants when ‘publishing’ my final report. I also had to be clear in indicating the other professionals (tutors and manager) who would see the data, and my finished report. (Adapted from Picken, unpublished 2007)

There are a number of features in this account, not least a willingness to review local core principles in advance of externally driven change. Firstly, the investigation is reflexive in terms of the levels of reflective practice represented by Newman and Pollnitz’s (2002) ethical response cycle – Linda is conducting a critical review of her own values and practice as part of a process of change. In addition, this account of planning for her investigation covers a range of expected professional proprieties:

- obtaining approval from management committees/authorities;
- obtaining consent/permissions from participants and their representatives;

- publicising procedure and principles so that there is ‘transparency’ in the investigation;
- informing those involved of their rights – there is choice offered in terms of participation;
- indicating the process for reporting or publishing the details of the investigation. In this case, the work was undertaken and published as part of a course. For practitioner investigations it is not unusual to share findings and experiences in a wider local network. *Provided all ethical considerations have been followed at the time*, your work should not be subject to veto or challenge at a later date;
- obtaining explicit authorisation for observation and visual data, the examination of files and records and the use of direct quotations from focus groups, also a feature of best practice.

These management action points relate to key themes for ethical practice which are developed below. Professional friends and mentors can offer support as your investigation progresses – at least to apply rigour to your ethical decisions. This strategy enables reflection in process so professional colleagues can also be involved in shaping the study and is illustrated in Figure 7.1 in Chapter 7.

Protecting others from harm – care for yourself and others

The summary by Plymouth Area Safeguarding Board of a Serious Case Review into incidents in a local nursery (2010, online) reveals, among many concerns, that practitioners in the setting lacked awareness of ethical propriety. The principle of ethical practice is fundamental to work with children and families yet is rarely made a conscious part of setting reflection. No doubt the framework outlined by our colleagues in Chapter 8 will inform and extend the awareness of leaders and managers to this area of self-appraisal and review, but it is invaluable for framing consideration of the ‘balance of power’ in investigations.

In formulating a plan for any investigation, you should also be sensitive to the context of your practice and the duties to protect from harm both children and vulnerable adults. Let us take the example of multi-agency settings as discussed by Whitmarsh (2007), and in particular the notion of ethical codes for work-based investigation as part of local policy. She notes that a national 'one-size fits all' notion of a research code of ethics may not be the solution to concern for protecting children and families as participants. We note that practitioners in children's centres may be working with many families who have been referred by social and care services. Some parents in this situation may well have mental health issues or be affected by the effects of social deprivation. Callan and Morrall (2009) argue that this does not mean that children and families are not competent and cannot exercise agency in terms of participation – indeed the families are representing social groups conventionally without a 'voice' as the result of isolation. However, while maintaining early years pedagogical principles of competency and agency, sensitive researchers need to be aware of the potential and actual vulnerability of participants of all ages. This involves careful reflection, as the longer-term implication of your proposed actions may not be immediately apparent. It is better to assume that all participants are *potentially* vulnerable in order to consider your assumptions and plan the conduct of the study. These ideas are extended here in relation to a second working example which 'revealed' power dynamics to the researcher.

Power and emotional literacy

For many managers and leaders, it may be useful to consider participant 'vulnerability' in terms of the balance of power in relationships within any investigation. This also requires a degree of emotional literacy (Pilcher, 2009) as it is recognised by Opie that informed consent of participants can have the institutional effect of 'absolving the researcher of their moral and ethical responsibility' (2004: 28). The following reflection on a practitioner investigation provides a working example of this concept in terms of work with adult colleagues. Here, Sue Foster is reflecting on the power and emotional dimensions of her research as an owner/manager.

> My investigation focused on developing outdoor provision in the Nursery. Really, it was an extension of an earlier study (Foster, 2006) where I concluded that as a team we needed a much more reflective approach to practice. I was trying to facilitate reflection in the context of developing our outdoor classroom and did so in a series of focus groups and workshops. Several of the staff mentioned their unpleasant school experiences and seemed wary, even nervous of what was going to be expected of them. I also felt on many occasions that there was an expectation that I would transmit all the information and

> that staff were passive rather than active, interested participants. As a result, I found it difficult to resist 'teaching' what I felt the participants needed to know. The barrier of participant's values and staff hierarchy did arise and I found all this quite frustrating.
>
> I realise that my expectations must have weighed very heavily on my staff. The targets I had in mind at the outset have now become a longer journey. However, I do feel that we took the first steps towards that goal. (Adapted from Foster, unpublished 2008)

Note how participation in research for colleagues in the closest and most successful teams can be a stressful experience. The team felt vulnerable, despite the careful attention to ethical protocol involved in the planning process, and this vulnerability extended to the leader.

Sharing experiences – how can I protect the well-being of participants?

Focus group discussions can involve sharing sensitive personal information at times and this could be upsetting for some members – the very opposite of the empowering outcome you will have planned. When planning your strategies, consider whether you enable the participants to control the extent of the personal information disclosed. Advice in terms of ethicality is to allow time to 'debrief' and make sure everyone is 'okay' (reflecting on the reflection) before disbanding. When writing up the discussion (the point at which it becomes your 'data'), very powerful responses can be identified and it is useful to revisit individually with some participants their choice to continue or not. For this reason, a research journal is vital for recording, planning and managing a work-based investigation. Journalising is a useful tool in its own right, shown by Mukherji and Albon (2010) as part of critical reflective practice.

In the same vein, be careful that in written accounts of activities, the same respectful concern is shown for the sensitivities of participants. When representing real conversations, ensure that their voices are 'authentic' in the reports. This will involve making a distinction between their voices and your own in writing up activities. In asking for verification of the experience from the group, they will have control over the record of their own conversation. While the reflection and interpretation may be your own, ensure that it is based on a proper understanding of the meanings intended by the group. Thus the core participant group might receive full 'reports' of the activities, having access to your own reflections and the progress of the study.

Through these techniques it is possible to demonstrate sensitivity to the people involved, as well as to decisions about the research process itself. In work-based practice it is hard to differentiate between a role as participant observer (insider) and the need to be an 'outsider' at the point of analysing data. Hitchcock and Hughes propose that 'teacher-researchers need, therefore, to be aware of the two roles that participant observation involves and be able to overcome any conflict during the research process by adopting as open an approach as possible' (1995: 48). Sharon Smith discusses how ethical issues extend to the use of and interpretation of data in Chapter 6.

This picture from practice offers further action points related to ethical planning. Building on the initial protocols of consultation, negotiation and consent, we can add the following:

- Involve stakeholders from the outset in the practice outcome that you envisage in order to shape the form of the study.

- Take account of the wishes of others concerning the level of their involvement. (In Sue Foster's experience there was a worry about activities requiring a degree of literacy. Offer alternatives – see Chapter 5 on creative approaches to methods.)

- Take care to exercise some emotional sensitivity concerning the conduct of your enquiry and identify support if needed for participants.

- Allow 'dissent' – participants may withdraw or challenge your interpretation.

- Ensure 'participant validation' which involves enabling your respondents to 'check' your descriptions and interpretation of their work/words for fairness and accuracy.

- Be sensitive to the nature of your 'reports' and dissemination of findings – different audiences may require different styles of presentation.

- Finally, make it clear what will happen to your data at the end of the study. There should be no need to keep materials beyond the life of the investigation.

Flewitt (2005) constructs a discussion about ethics on the notion of 'sharing' as it informs and underpins the research process. This is a feature characteristic of the work-based investigations featured in this text, and the notion of shared lives and stories offered by the approaches to investigations promoted in Chapter 3. As a researcher, recognising that you are part of a sharing *community* rather than a project leader will help form an ability to address the power balance apparent in professional hierarchies. It will also engage with the concept of communities of practice discussed in Chapter 7.

Care for yourself

To finalise this section, in which we have explored the notion of 'protection from harm', it is important to recognise that an ethical approach should also extend to consideration of *yourself*. For example, on a practical level, Mukherji and Albon (2010) note the importance of personal safety as part of your ethical responsibilities. While you will be motivated to ensure your participants are as comfortable as possible in your study, when collecting individual responses you are advised to be aware of your own potential vulnerability if visiting (for example) private accommodation. This point may also lead you to reflect on how to maintain professional relationships within an inclusive approach to management of practice.

Work with young children and families is challenging and demanding. Care for yourself enables you to conserve energy in a situation where the demands of the job involve consistently giving energy away – to your team, to the children and to families (Robins and Callan, 2009). Aubrey et al. (2000) remind us that it is important to extend the same concern to yourself and your 'supporters'. It is imperative not to neglect personal relationships in the process of your work and research. At the very least, keep in mind that as an early years practitioner you should 'practise what you preach'.

Inclusion and diversity – meaningful participation for children and adults

The strategies outlined above demonstrate an ethical approach in that they are representative of respectful practice. In constructing plans for investigation, practitioners will give due regard to the factors that inhibit or enhance the involvement of participants – we have noted considerations of time and personal/social contexts in particular. These issues can also be extended to consideration of the purpose and nature of involvement and from there to ensuring inclusive approaches.

It is respectful of children and families to consider whether their participation is strictly necessary at every part of the investigation – as this reflection on the development of Linda's (Picken, unpublished 2007) original research plan demonstrates. Here we can see how she moved from a plan involving a fairly superficial 'consultation' exercise to consideration of more meaningful involvement at a later stage of an evolving enquiry – an example clearly representative of the Early Childhood Australia ethical code (2010, online).

> The focus group helped to give the study validity; it helped create data, which was valid in supporting our reflection on values and assisting decisions about the future evolution of our practice for implementing the EYFS. The focus groups also occurred in parallel to my continued reading/literature exploration, shared with professional colleagues in the local authority – including the practice improvement team for early years. In the course of this process, I recognised that, whilst the children were going to be the primary end users of our provision, given the evolution of the investigation, it would have been difficult to directly involve them at this stage in any meaningful way. In making this a practitioner-focussed study, I did not overlook the need for some triangulation. As the study evolved, this changed from the stakeholders in the setting, to some colleagues from my team, involvement of outside professionals and local agencies and my independent review of expert opinion through literature search. I can see that this was far more relevant to the stage of our reflection than my original action plan. Once we had received our training about the EYFS from the local authority and were more aware of the expectations placed upon us, parents and children were involved in evaluation of our provision as we worked together to embed the new requirements. (Adapted from Picken, unpublished 2007)

We can see from this example that allowing time to clarify the purpose of involvement for the participants can offer focus to your selection of methods in a continuing spiral of reflection. Once this is apparent, a sensitive approach to diversity is essential. For example, bilingual colleagues may facilitate the involvement of children and parents with English as an additional language, either by directly translating conversation or offering dual-language presentation of questionnaires. Naturally, you will need to include colleagues in ethical discussion about confidentiality of data and acknowledge their involvement in terms of parental consent and permissions. Your focus in planning your investigation will be primarily informed by professional principles and a consideration of how to involve other participants with specific needs – literacy having been noted in the examples above. The work of Rose Drury

(2007) is a good reference point and source of information for inclusive strategies.

Selecting appropriate methods – principles for active participation and well-being

It is clear that some strategies for research with young children enable an inclusive approach so that even the youngest, pre-verbal children will have a 'voice' in your investigations. As a result of continuing professional development activities, experienced practitioners should be aware of the Mosaic approach, in which Alison Clark (2004) has proposed a selection of child-centred strategies in a research 'toolkit' (as explored in Chapters 3 and 5). These strategies are particularly relevant to work-based investigations since many projects centre on improving the child's experience in practice. In terms of ethics, the approach is consistent with rights-based practice and EYFS (DCSF, 2008a) principles of listening to children. Clark's tools provide children with agency and real involvement rather than a superficial consultation based on (say) 'interviews' formulated to suit an adult 'agenda'. Mukherji and Albon (2010) note that traditional methods such as observation are vital to carrying out research with very young children and babies – and employing interview techniques continues to be useful, providing that the children are able to participate. At a practical level, if we apply our knowledge of theory to research planning, we can identify that the Mosaic approach suits children as participants because it involves their active participation and consideration of their expressed views (or behavioural responses) in constructing a shared understanding of our environment. In terms of the philosophies informing current practice, we can see that the Mosaic methods value the creativity and imagination of children.

For work with children, Alderson (2005) proposes that we adopt an ethical stance that is based on the notion that involvement will be based on their interests and level of knowledge and understanding. This highlights what they know and can do rather than presenting a situation that is difficult for them. In consideration of strategies for inclusion, we need to evaluate our research planning on the basis of these values to ensure that children are empowered in the investigation – they can exercise *choice*. This approach will apply to other groups of participants who may traditionally be 'hard to engage' (see Chapter 3), but for all participants we must aim to ensure:

- meaningful inclusion on the basis of access, language, literacy and culture;
- involvement linked to their real, rather than perceived, interests and knowledge;
- an experience that provides a situation that is affirming of their abilities, sensitive to their needs and respects their expertise with regard to their own experiences.

Overall, it is worth considering your responsibility to respond to the needs of the children while you are undertaking research activities such as video recording and observations. These methods are recognised as 'naturalistic' in terms of the Mosaic approach and can be interpreted for your findings. However, you should be clear that, when observing children as part of daily practice, it is necessary to exercise some sensitivity to a child's feelings at that particular time. You will make decisions about whether it is 'fair' to continue your observation if (say) the child appears to be overly tired. In research practice involving children or participants with specific needs who may be unable to articulate their own anxieties, the professional duty to protect their interests must remain central to your conduct. There may well be a tension between the time frame for your investigation and the recognition that 'now' is not a 'good time', but you will always strive to act ethically. 'Tuning in' to the children's mood can help you overcome the conflict that may occur between concepts of 'participant consent', and 'agreement' that have to be maintained over a longitudinal study. At the very least, bear in mind that when parents *consent* to their child's involvement, their *agreement* is based on the expectation that you will be responsible for the child's well-being during the actual research activity in their absence.

The challenges of working with the Internet

In ethical terms, use of the Web and ICT tools presents challenges for exercising personal integrity in keeping to your research 'contract'. However, in practice, providers of children's services are increasingly turning to such technology as part of managing parent expectations and communication. For example, the use of a webcam, text messaging and web pages for information about the setting all promote access and involvement of parents and carers, but leaders have had to deal sensitively with the ethical issues involved, the more so given the outcomes of the Plymouth review (Plymouth Safeguarding Board, 2010, online). Similarly, it is important to consider visual data (observations, video/recording equipment and photographs) as part of the same ethical approach. While Mukherji and Albon (2010) offer a sound overview of such methods, it is made clear that ethical deliberations will include specific, informed consent for such recording – including details of who will see it, secure storage and how long the material will be kept. Recent high-profile legal cases in England (Plymouth Safeguarding Board, 2010, online) have highlighted the concern about the Internet and safeguarding issues, so practitioners need to be aware of any local authority guidelines in this respect and honour these in formulating a plan for investigation.

In researching practice, some leaders have effectively employed the professional networks to be found through the Internet, so it is important to consider web-based conferencing in this context. While the basic protocols outlined throughout the chapter all apply, Eysenbach and Till (2001) demonstrate that there are issues specific to Internet research for consideration. Use of the World Wide Web raises particular questions about informed consent and confidentiality – mainly because it is possible to study the information and discussion groups as an observer and not 'announce' yourself or your intentions to participants. Similarly, it is possible to participate in communication without announcing your motivation and intention to use content – yet it can be complex to engage in traditional research approaches where the researcher is identified and utilising online interviews, focus groups or surveys.

At this point it is easy to understand why key themes of anonymity and confidentiality in relation to specific research methods are regarded by Flewitt (2005) as an ethical minefield. Internet users do not necessarily expect to be research subjects, and although they inhabit a public space, they are very much located in the privacy of their own context which can impact on the understanding of 'consent' and issues of 'validation' discussed in Chapter 2. Denscombe (2010) also recognises the need to appreciate the limitations of confidentiality and privacy when using the Internet. O'Dochartaigh (2002) reinforces this point by reminding us that there is technology to allow agencies for security and policing to trace the origins of any Internet communication to source if they so wish. Put simply, it is impossible to guarantee anonymity and confidentiality in this context.

However, we would encourage practitioners to engage in the digital landscape as part of their developing practice and, for advice on using this medium for research, the recent work of Ford (2011) is particularly useful.

The following example shows how one experienced practitioner worked to resolve these difficulties in an investigation utilising the Internet community of parents engaged in the evolution of 'baby signing' as part of language development.

Professional propriety

> Posting an open message on the relevant network site facilitated explanation of the research agenda and personal interests. It gave the opportunity for interested individuals to volunteer, to gain further information and to 'opt in' to the study. 'Formal' permission was then obtained from those individuals, who then contributed to the study through shared personal experiences and the electronic completion of a questionnaire. Undertakings about debriefing at the end of the study and data storage/disposal were provided at the initial stage of gaining consent.

Protection from harm

> Participant details were kept confidential in reporting the study. Material and contact was made only through public sites or from individuals aware of the research agenda. Note that in small-scale work-based investigations the data gathered would not be in the public domain. It was still necessary to consider 'protection' issues in order to decide what to leave out when presenting findings in the final report.

Transparency

> As this practitioner was also using case study/significant incident recording of her own child's communication strategies, she was personally positioned in the centre of the project. She had to be clear when she was collecting data and record a commitment to fair representation of findings (rather than just things that agreed with her own perspective).

The key to the effectiveness of this study lay in careful planning and research around ethical issues for the particular context involved and discussing strategies with professional critical friends – a process applicable in all situations.

Summary

We have stressed that issues of ethicality are aligned with trustful relationships in open, honest communication – a professional way of ‘being’. Such transparency is a professional principle for work in early years, but it is also a mindset that informs the professional management of workplace investigation. Whether an investigation is ‘informal’ (remaining within the confines of the setting) or the subject of formal report as a small-scale academic project, the decisions and practices relating to ethicality will determine the credibility of outcome for future practice. ‘Ethics’ is concerned with far more than issues of ‘anonymity’ and ‘confidentiality’, as is detailed in Chapter 8. Close attention to ethical issues will inform your development as an ethical leader/manager, a reflective practitioner and a critical researcher. We show in Chapter 7 that practitioner investigation will contribute to professional knowledge, enhance the quality of provision and offer the opportunity for communities in practice to share an affirming experience. As personal, professional development, it enables practitioners to contribute to wider networks and discourses about ‘quality’ on the basis of informed, grounded and critical reflective practice.

Further reading

The following text seems to us to be very contemporary and further investigation of the chapters on ‘Researchers as Insiders or Outsiders’ and ‘Assessing Harms and Benefits’ would be useful:

Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2011) *The Ethics of Research with Children and Young People: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.

For an exploration of the various guidelines to ethical practice see the following online sources. It should be possible to identify how these frameworks have informed our chapter.

Scottish Educational Research Association (SERA) (2005) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. Online at: http://www.sera.ac.uk.
British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2004) *Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. Southwell. Online at: http://www.bera.ac.uk/.
American Educational Research Association (AERA) (2000) *Ethical Standards of AERA*. Online at: http://www.aera.net/about/policy/ethics.htm.