Kiste, R.
1976 The People of Enewetak Atoll vs. the U.S. Department of Defense. *In* Ethics and Anthropology. M. Rynkiewich and J. Spradley, eds. Pp. 74-75. New York: Wiley.

Klockars, C. B.
1977 Field Ethics for the Life History. *In* Street Ethnography: Selected Studies of Crime and Drug Use in Natural Settings. R. S. Weppner, ed. Pp. 210-226. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
1979 Dirty Hands and Deviant Subjects. *In* Deviance and Decency: The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects. C. B. Klockars and F. W. O'Connor, eds. Pp. 261-282. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Kobben, A.
1967 Participation and Quantification: Fieldwork among the Dyuka. *In* Anthropologists in the Field. D. G. Jongmans and P. Gutkind, eds. Pp. 35-55. New York: Humanities Press.

McCurdy, D.
1976 The Medicine Man. *In* Ethics and Fieldwork: Dilemmas in Fieldwork. M. Fynkiewich and J. Spradley, eds. Pp. 4-16. New York: Wiley.

Mead, M.
1969 Research with Human Beings: A Model Derived from Anthropological Field Practice. *In* Experimentation with Human Subjects. P. Freund, ed. Pp. 152-177. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mills, C.
1959 The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mulhauser, F.
1975 Ethnography and Policymaking: The Case of Education. Human Organization 34:311.

Nader, T.
1969 Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. *In* Reinventing Anthropology. D. Hymes, ed. Pp. 284-311. New York: Vintage Press.

Paine, W. S., ed.
1982 Job Stress and Burnout: Research, Theory and Intervention Perspectives. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Peattie, L.
1968 The View from the Barrio. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pelto, P.
1970 Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. New York: Harper & Row.

Polsky, N.
1967 Hustlers, Beats, and Others. Chicago: Aldine.

Reiman, J. H.
1979 Research Subjects, Political Subjects, and Human Subjects. *In* Deviance and Decency: The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects. C. B. Klockars and F. W. O'Connor, eds. Pp. 35-57. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Reynolds, P. D.
1979 Ethical Dilemmas and Social Science Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sahlins, M.
1967 The Established Order: Do Not Fold, Spindle, or Mutilate. *In* The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics. J. Horowitz, ed. Pp. 71-79. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Soloway, I., and J. Walters
1977 Workin' the Corner: The Ethics and Legality of Ethnographic Fieldwork among Active Heroin Addicts. *In* Street Ethnography: Selected Studies of Crime and Drug Use in Natural Settings. R. S. Weppner, ed. Pp. 159-178. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Solzhenitsyn, A.
1972 For the Good of the Cause. D. Hoyd and M. Hayward, transls. New York: Praeger.

Spradley, J.
1976 Trouble in the Tank. *In* Ethics and Fieldwork: Dilemmas in Fieldwork. M. Rynkiewich and J. Spradley, eds. Pp. 17-31. New York: Wiley.

Thorne, B.
1980 You Still Takin' Notes? Fieldwork and Problems of Informal Consent. Social Problems 27(3):284-297.

Tobin, J. A.
1967 The Resettlement of the Enewetak People: A Study of a Displaced Community in the Marshall Islands. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Wax, R.
1960 Twelve Years Later: An Analysis of Field Experience. *In* Human Organization Research. R. Adams and J. Preiss, eds. Pp. 166-178. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.
1971 Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, M.
1946 From Max Weber's Essays in Sociology. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, transls. and eds. New York: Oxford University Press.

Whyte, W. F.
1943 Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolcott, H.
1975 Criteria for an Ethnographic Approach to Research in Schools. Human Organization 34(2):111-127.
1980 How to Look Like an Anthropologist without Really Being One. Practicing Anthropology 3(2):6-7,.56-59.

Yablonsky, L.
1965 Experiences with the Criminal Community. *In* Applied Sociology. A. W. Gouldner and S. M. Miller, eds. Pp. 55-73. New York: Free Press.

The experience also provided an insight into who the program could and could not serve in the inner city.

REFERENCES CITED

Beattie, J.
1965 Understanding an African Kingdom: Banyoro. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Becker, H. S.
1976 Whose Side Are We On? Social Problems 14(3):239-247.
Berreman, G.
1962 Behind Many Masks. Monograph 4. Ithaca, N.Y.: Society for Applied Anthropology.
1968 Is Anthropology Alive? Social Responsibility in Social Anthropology. Current Anthropology 9:391-396.
1969 Academic Colonialism: Not So Innocent Abroad. The Nation, November 10.
Britan, G. M.
1977 Public Policy and Innovation: An Ethnographic Evaluation of the Experimental Technology Incentives Program. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
1978 The Place of Anthropology in Program Evaluation. Anthropological Quarterly 51(2):119-128.
Burns, A.
1975 An Anthropologist at Work. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 6(4):28-34.
1978 On the Ethnographic Process in Anthropology and Education. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 9(4):18-34.
Cassell, J.
1980 Ethical Principles for Conducting Fieldwork. American Anthropologist 82(1):28-41.
Chambers, E.
1980 Fieldwork and the Law: New Context for Ethical Decision Making. Social Problems 27(3):330-341.
Cherniss, C.
1980 Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services, Vol. 2. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
Clinton, C. A.
1975 The Anthropologist as Hired Hand. Human Organization 34:197-204.
1976 On Bargaining with the Devil: Contract Ethnography and Accountability in Fieldwork. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8:25-29.
Colfer, C. J.
1976 Rights, Responsibilities, and Reports: An Ethical Dilemma in Contract Research. In Ethics and Anthropology. M. A. Rynkiewich and J. P. Spradley, eds. Pp. 32-46. New York: Wiley.
Coward, R.
1976 The Involvement of Anthropologists in Contract Evaluations: The Federal Perspective. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 7:12-16.
Deloria, V.
1980 Our New Research Society: Some Warnings to Social Scientists. Social Problems 27(3):265-271.
Diamond, S.
1964 Nigerian Discovery: The Politics of Fieldwork. In Reflections on Community Studies. Vidick, Bensman and Stern, eds. Pp. 119-154. New York: Wiley.
Ellsberg, D.
1972 Papers on the War (Pentagon Papers). New York: Simon & Schuster.
Everhart, R. B.
1975 Problems of Doing Fieldwork in Educational Evaluation. Human Organization 34(3):183-196.

Fetterman, D. M.
1980 Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Evaluation: An Illustration. Journal of Thought, Special Ed. (December): 31-48.
1981a Study of the Career Intern Program. Final Report. Task C: Program Dynamics: Structure, Function and Interrelationships. Mountain View, Calif.: RMC Research Corporation.
1981b New Perils for the Contract Ethnographer. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 12:71-83.
1981c Blaming the Victim: The Problem of Evaluation Design, Federal Involvement, and Reinforcing World Views in Education. Human Organization 40:67-77.
1982a Ethnography in Educational Research: The Dynamics of Diffusion. Educational Researcher (March):17-29.
1982b Ibsen's Baths: Reactivity and Insensitivity (A Misapplication of the Treatment-Control Design in a National Evaluation). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 4(3):261-279.
Firestone, W. A.
1975 Educational Field Research in a "Contract Shop." American Educational Research Association, Division Generator 5(3): 3-11.
Fitzsimmons, S. J.
1975 The Anthropologist in a Strange Land. Human Organization 34(2):183-196.
Gallagher, A., Jr.
1964 The Role of the Advocate and Directed Change. In Media and Educational Innovations. W. C. Meierhenry, ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Gallin, B.
1959 A Case for Intervention in the Field. Human Organization 18(3):140-144.
Gearing, F.
1973 The Strategy of the Fox Project. In To See Ourselves: Anthropology and Modern Social Issues. Pp. 438-441. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
Gough, K.
1968 World Revolution and the Science of Man. In The Dissenting Academy. T. Roszak, ed. Pp. 135-158. New York: Random House.
Gouldner, A. W.
1968 The Sociologist as Partisan: Sociology and the Welfare State. American Sociologist 3(1):103-116.
Hall, G.
1978 Ethnographers and Ethnographic Data, An Iceberg of the First Order for the Research Manager. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
Holmberg, A.
1954 Adventures in Culture Change. In Method and Perspective in Anthropology. R. F. Spencer, ed. Pp. 103-116. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
1958 The Research and Development Approach to the Study of Change. Human Organization 17(1):12-16.
1969 Nomads of the Long Bow: The Survivors of Eastern Bolivia. Garden City, N.Y.: The Natural History Press.
Hord, S.
1978 Under the Eye of the Ethnographer: Reactions and Perceptions of the Observed. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
Horowitz, J.
1965 The Life and Death of Project Camelot. Trans-action (December).
Ibsen, H.
1959 An Enemy of the People. In Four Great Plays by Henrik Ibsen. Pp. 129-216. New York: Dutton.
James, J.
1977 Ethnography and Social Problems. In Street Ethnography: Selected Studies of Crime and Drug Use in Natural Settings. R. S. Weppner, ed. Pp. 179-200. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

the research community can be excellent tension relievers—for both informants and researchers. After all, at least in small communities the ubiquitous presence of "the man with the notebook and a thousand questions" can be very taxing for the local inhabitants. They must surely wish that for once they could enact a small bit of local custom without having to explain it all to the anthropologist. A few days away—or even longer—in the city, at the beach, hiking in the mountains, or visiting a nearby game reservation—can give the field-worker time to dissipate his anxieties and hostilities, get some needed physical rest, and perhaps restock his supplies. At the same time, the research community itself gets a rest. Often the return of the field-worker after even a brief vacation is an occasion for a warm welcome, a reaffirmation of friendships. He may be treated like a returning relative, and a few slightly reluctant informants may have been opened up a bit in their willingness to give information (Pelto 1970:225).

One of the few redeeming features of this work life-style, aside from meeting new people, is that it enables you to step back from the field experience to gain perspective and then back in to test one's hypotheses throughout the year. This is an advantage over traditional fieldwork where it is much easier to "go native," or lose touch with the primary research task at hand.

Conclusion

Moral decision making is a tortuous process, since each event is a convoluted and almost endless labyrinth of considerations and commitments. A simple shift in perspective or an unexpected twist of fate can alter one's entire set of responsibilities and obligations. Guilty knowledge and dirty hands are at the heart of the urban fieldwork experience. Recognition of this fact is essential if a field-worker is to function effectively and morally. Awareness of the context of research can prevent paralysis as well as overzealousness in the field.

Ethical decisions in fieldwork must continuously be discussed and reviewed. This is not to suggest that we must institute sanctions against ethical wrongdoing, for "the cost of emphasizing punishment as a means of regulation and control of occupational deviance is that it suppresses the kind of candid moral discourse which is necessary to make genuine moral maturity possible" (Klockars 1979:279).

Field-workers will continue to encounter numerous personal and professional hazards in contract research. They may range from fieldwork conducted in an accelerated fashion to reporting in a highly political atmosphere. Many of these pressures affect one's judgment while in the field—whether in the streets of the inner city or in plush conference rooms with governmental officials in Washington, D.C. Ethnographers can adapt to most of these environmental pressures if they are aware of them.

There have been few times in the past century when it has been so important for fieldworkers to involve themselves in processes of ethical decision making. As we do so, we are well advised to temper our instincts for self-preservation and self-determination with a realistic sense of the full range of contexts which impinge on contemporary research activities. Two seemingly opposite images come to mind. The first is an image of a world breathing down our necks, and the second is an image of a world ignoring us entirely (Chambers 1980:341).

Participation in the art of moral decision making may not prevent the world from "breathing down our necks" or from "ignoring us," but it will ensure that we do not forget our own multiple sets of responsibilities.

To improve the level of fieldwork practice, investigators must examine the moral dilemmas particular to this type of research, discover the appropriate ethical principles, and learn how best to apply them. If it is not done, regulation will become an elaborate and expensive charade, useful only in assuaging the sensibilities of legislators, who can convince themselves that they did their best to legislate morality without ever having bothered to examine just what moral standards are appropriate to a particular scientific method (Cassell 1980:38).

This exploration into the hazards and ethical dilemmas that arise from urban fieldwork and contract research has attempted to examine the appropriateness of certain moral standards to the ethnographic method. It is hoped that this probing will be reflexive, stimulating other field-workers in anthropology and other disciplines to examine themselves in their pursuit of knowledge.

NOTES

[1] For further details regarding the role of the ethnographer in educational evaluation, see Britan 1977, 1978; Burns 1975, 1978; Clinton 1975, 1976; Colfer 1976; Coward 1976; Everhart 1975; Fetterman 1980, 1981a, 1981b, 1981c; Firestone 1975; Fitzsimmons 1975; Hall 1978; Hord 1978; Mulhauser 1975; and Wolcott 1980.

[2] It should be emphasized that this involves working with colleagues from different disciplines and potentially conflicting paradigms in a multidisciplinary effort.

[3] Weber's "Politics as a Vocation" (1946) is a study of the moral hazards of a political career. It emphasizes the use of morally dubious means in the attainment of "good ends." The parallel between the context of contemporary research and the political environment that Weber discussed highlights this moral hazard for contract research.

[4] Weber's term was an "ethic of responsibility" (1946:120).

[5] In the Soloway and Walters case no law was broken, according to the Pennsylvania penal code (see Soloway and Walters 1977:172-174). The moral issue remains, and in other states the legal status of the event might differ significantly. It is inappropriate, however, to second-guess the legitimacy of a field-worker's actions in hindsight. There are a multitude of factors influencing behavior in the field at any given moment. Moreover, serendipity more closely characterizes even the most diligent efforts at structuring ethnography. Soloway and Walter's case indirectly emphasized the unpredictability of fieldwork.

[6] The respect-for-persons ethic is usually applied to situations in which a researcher is contemplating deceit in order to secure information from a subject. The respect-for-persons ethic can also be applied to situations in which the researcher considers breaching a trust. These two examples demonstrate the role of "different levels of analysis" in ethical decision making.

[7] This experience differs from what Wax describes as "when the fieldworker's overblown sense of his ability to offend or injure his hosts may so paralyze him that he cannot carry on his work"(1971:274). This type of problem can occur at the early stages of fieldwork when the ethnographer is overly sensitive to informants. Pauline Kael's solution, as noted in Wax (1971) is useful in this regard, "a mistake in judgment is not necessarily fatal, but that too much anxiety about judgment is." Nevertheless, although there are similarities of inaction, the problem Wax describes is more of a methodological problem related to the early stages of fieldwork, while the problem discussed in this review is an ethical problem related to the respect-for-persons ethic in the process of conducting fieldwork.

[8] In the study under discussion, most of the students involved in crime were involved in dope dealing, pimping, and petty theft; few were involved in "hard core" burglary. The "hard core" group was known in the community to have its own rules, sanctions, and social structure. This experience signaled to the "hard core" group what my role and position was regarding the burglary group in the community.

receive the report, according to the parent organization, because they misused it the last time; they revealed portions of the confidential draft report to various sources out of context. In the first case, it was true that the report referred to the old staff and would not have been productive reading for the new staff. In the second case, the evaluators would have fed the fire of this rivalry if it were to circumvent the system of protocol by sending the drafts to the sites directly. However, they would not be fulfilling their obligation if they allowed the parent organization to control the distribution of the report.

A compromise was made. All the copies were sent to the parent organization to follow protocol and avoid charges of favoritism. A provision was made, however, that site comments would be requested directly by the evaluators by the end of the month. Any report lost in the mail would then be sent directly to the site by the evaluators. This placed a check on the distribution of the drafts without compromising the evaluator's role or neglecting the significance of protocol.

The presentation of findings to the public is a political activity. The manner in which research findings are presented influence how the information will be used or abused. The researcher who plays the role of politician while conducting and presenting findings, however, is likely to be used as a pawn by various vested interests. The dissemination of findings after the research has been conducted is a separate matter. The evaluators disseminated the generally positive findings to appropriate individuals in government and quasi-governmental institutions. Future funding for the program was dependent on the dissemination of the evaluation findings and the recommendations of various agencies. In addition, the evaluators prepared a Joint Dissemination Review Panel Submission that was substantially based on the ethnographic findings to improve the program's credibility and potential to secure future funding. (This was accomplished in the face of significant resistance because it was politically hazardous to favor social programs during this period.) These actions were in accord with Mills's position:

There is no necessity for working social scientists to allow the potential meaning of their work to be shaped by the "accidents" of its setting, or its use to be determined by the purposes of other men. It is quite within their powers to discuss its meanings and decide upon its uses as matters of their own policy (1959:177).

The evaluators agreed that they had a moral responsibility to serve as an advocate for the program based on the research findings. As James has discussed: "Advocacy on behalf of social change is the final step in the use of ethnography. It is also the only reasonable justification for probing the life-styles of these human beings" (1977:198). There is a difference between being an academic and an activist; however, academic study does not preclude advocacy. In fact, often anything less represents an abdication of one's responsibility as a social scientist (see Berreman 1968; and Gough 1968). It should be acknowledged, however, that the researcher functions as a public relations person or politician in this arena rather than as a researcher.

Job Stress and Burnout

Finally, the ethnographic evaluator faces one of the most common but least discussed hazards in the profession: job stress and burnout. The job-related stress that an ethnographic evaluator or field-worker experiences has been discussed throughout this review. Job burnout involves the complete loss of interest or motivation in pursuing the individual employment tasks required to satisfactorily function in one's role. This is often the result of prolonged exposure to the pressures of the job. This can severely cripple the most able researcher. Judgment, determination, and stamina (all critical qualities for a field-worker) are all affected by job stress and burnout. Fieldwork in contract ethnography must be conducted at an accelerated pace in a much shorter period of time than traditional fieldwork. This is both physically and mentally demanding. Continuous immersion in the personal and professional problems of informants can be emotionally draining as well. Stories of arson-for-hire, a mother stabbing her daughter's boyfriend, an administrator harassing a staff member, graft, and racism are part of the everyday lives of many informants; however, this continual immersion into hundreds of individual lives can take its toll on the ethnographer. Wax (1971) provided a detailed picture in this regard of "shooting, beating and murder" and the resultant turmoil she experienced in a Japanese-American relocation center. Kobben reported of his Surinam fieldwork that

since an ethnographer studies people and not insects, his fieldwork also causes emotions in himself. Personally, I lived under great psychological stress and felt little of the proverbial peacefulness of "country life." Few books touch on the subject, but I know that the same is true of quite a number of other fieldworkers. Perhaps it is even a *sine qua non* for fieldwork (1967:46).

The theory, research, and intervention practices related to job stress and burnout in human services occupations are discussed in detail in Cherniss (1980) and Paine (1982).

This experience is compounded by the "father confessor" or mea culpa compression effect. Contract research requires in-depth immersion in a site for short periods of time at regular intervals throughout the year. Informants realize the ethnographer will only be on-site for a week or two and rush to communicate pressing problems. The nature of the visits structures the informant's response. An effort must be made to take this phenomenon into consideration—to balance one's perspective of the site's operations. Once a rapport is established with a few key informants and the ethnographer learns who must be listened to with a grain of salt this problem can be ameliorated.

The fieldwork experience is made more stressful by a demanding travel schedule. One- to two-week site visits throughout the country can keep a researcher away from home for over a month at a time. Life on the road has all the hazards faced by old-time salesmen: road food, empty motels, and the routine separation from family—in this case every three months. Allan Holmberg (1969) provided vivid illustrations of the physically draining side of fieldwork (also see Wax 1960: 175). A few survival tips learned in the field to cope with this type of stress include maintaining regular contacts with family, spending time with friends in the field in relaxing or entertaining settings, or meeting relatives or colleagues during weekends or "break periods" while on the road. Also, attending professional meetings during these free periods serves to recharge oneself while in the field. Pelto emphasizes the value of brief vacations during the fieldwork experience.

A number of fieldworkers have noted that brief vacations away from

the site of numerous nuclear tests. The PACE project planned to use this area for further high-explosive testing and used parts of Tobin's work to support their position. Tobin responded,

I did not give you permission to do this and it is protected by copyright as clearly indicated in the early part of my dissertation. Parts of this work that would have helped the people of Eniwetok against the PACE program were not quoted in the draft environmental statement.

I am biased against the PACE program as I have told Mr. _____ [the director of PACE] as I feel it is against the best interests of the Eniwetok people and it is against their expressed wishes (Department of the Air Force, 1973:56).

The ethnographer's moral obligation, in this example, required a written response to protect the interests of the people of Eniwetok and the use of his own publication.

Serious ethical dilemmas emerge, however, when one's role makes one privy to confidential information that requires exposure. Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* (1959), Solzhenitsyn's *For the Good of the Cause* (1972), and Daniel Ellsberg's *Papers on the War* (Pentagon Papers) (1972) dramatically illustrate this type of double bind. In one of my studies, this type of double bind was confronted on every level. A few of those encountered in the street have already been discussed. The school setting provided numerous cases. For example, substituting for a sick teacher presented no serious difficulty; however, substituting for a frequently tardy or alcoholic teacher presented a number of difficulties. Should the researcher condone such behavior and administrative laxness by substituting for the teacher and not reporting the incident in his or her report? Or, should the researcher simply look at the practical side—the students need a teacher for that period? From a research perspective, serving as a teacher-researcher provides an invaluable insight into the program. Moreover, the problem of managerial laxness can be demonstrated in other manners. In this case, a risk-benefit approach was extremely useful in moral decision making. The risks of reporting the incident for the individual teacher's reputation and the program's survival outweighed the benefits, given that the matter could be resolved with less drastic measures (informally bringing the problem to the attention of the school administrator). The matter would have required publication if administration had not resolved the problem immediately, because the risk to the student population (of dropping out again) and to the staff (lowering morale) would have been greater than the benefits of protecting one teacher and administrator's positions. Discretion, in any case, must be exercised in the case of reporting observed indiscretions. For example, reporting a rare occurrence such as a fight or an affair between a student and a staff member on school grounds can unfairly distort a picture of program operations. Moreover, the consequences of reporting such behavior "may not match the crime"; for example, the entire program could be closed down for such activities. (See Deloria 1980 for a discussion of a larger social context of research and role of researcher.)

Another problem that must be confronted is the power of numerous vested interests. The pressures of various vested interest groups often impinge on the ethnographer's ability to produce a fair and balanced report of study findings. For example, in the study discussed above the staff wanted me to record and document the implementation difficulties in the report as a means of solving their programmatic problems. The disseminators, however, took a different position. They commented on a draft of one of the reports that the ethnographic study was "a scholarly approach," however, they were concerned with the presentation of the findings.

Certainly, [the disseminating agency] has gleaned a great deal of knowledge during the demonstration which we are applying to future replication approaches. [The research corporation] has been very helpful in this regard. However, we are down to the wire in terms of the presentation of the final results to society at large. Certainly, [the disseminating agency] has a vested interest in the [program] being presented in the final reports in the best possible light. I am sure that others such as _____, _____ [federal agencies], and [the research corporation] feel the same. . . . [Program]expansion in the future faces an uncertain future in this age of shrinking financial resources and competitive and political realities, etc. We need to present the most accurate, fair, and balanced picture of the replication which, hopefully, proves that [the program] merits continuation and expansion. I trust that you will consider the same.

Their message was clear. I was sympathetic to the political realities; however, I was obligated to include some negative findings to present the most accurate picture of program operations. For example, along with numerous positive findings I included serious implementation problems such as high staff turnover rates and managerial incompetence and/or lack of appropriate qualifications. These problems had a serious impact on program operations. The negative impact of the federal government and the evaluators was also discussed to provide a picture of the extrinsic forces that negatively affected the program and resulted in unfavorable site descriptions (Fetterman 1981a, 1981c). This was an example of "studying up" in the stratification system (Nader 1969). Ignoring these problems would have done little for knowledge development in the area of implementation and distorted the readers' view of program operations. This would have represented an abdication of my responsibility to the staff, taxpayers, and my colleagues. A basic misconception that was dispelled in this regard is that ethnographers are always co-opted by their informants and always present the most positive side (their key informant's side). The duty of the ethnographer, like any scientist, is fundamentally to accurately record and report his or her observations and interpretations. In this case, the observations were primarily positive but the findings were not exclusively placed in a positive light.

Dissemination of Findings

The dissemination of the draft report was also problematic. The code of ethics explains that the findings of research must be shared with clients and sponsors. This guide, however, does not prepare the researcher for dealing with many levels of administration and protocol. In the study under discussion there was a rivalry between the parent organization disseminating the alternative high school program and some of the local affiliates directly responsible for managing the programs. The parent organization was the central conduit for draft reports. The evaluators were informed, however, that one site would not receive the draft for comments because they had new management and staff and would be demoralized by the descriptions of past strife. In addition, the new program would not have the background required to critique the work. The evaluators were also informed that another site would not

Later I learned that he was known by everyone in the community and "no one crosses the man." I was introduced to him later in the study and learned that he ran the "underworld" portion of the community. This experience provided numerous insights into the students and dropouts in the community. The burglar finally called that night and offered to sell me my materials at $15 a folder (20 folders). I agreed on a trial basis: 1 folder at a time. Corina served as "go between." The venture failed. The burglar took the money and kept the folder. We set up another series of phone negotiations to recover the goods, also unsuccessful. I eventually called them and told them I knew who they were and where they lived and if the materials were not returned in an hour I would call the police.

I waited for two hours—no response. I called the police and explained that I had decided to prosecute. They said they would not go in at night and would pursue the matter in the morning. In brief, I had to orchestrate the entire event: secure the deposition from the witness, find the exact location of the burglars, and bring the police to the location. The burglars were arrested and prosecuted with the "blessing of the community." During the booking proceedings, when the police officers left the room for a minute, one of the burglars leaned over and whispered to me "we've heard about what you're doin' and we know that you're trying' to help the brother so we'll try to get the book stuff back to you after this is all over."

They later explained that they wanted to get busted. One of them said:

We're hot now, ya see. So if we just chill out for a month or two somebody else is in the spotlight, ya see. And then we can go along with our business with no more trouble. There's just a little too much heat on us right now, don't ya know.

I am still negotiating with them, however. I do not anticipate recovering the goods.

This experience demonstrates that intervention can yield positive results and what steps were required before such behavior is appropriate. "The dilemma of the fieldworker . . . is not *whether* to interfere in the local cultural scene, but *how much* to interfere" (Pelto 1970:223). This experience required intensive involvement. I had been in the field long enough to know the members of the community in depth. In addition, I understood most of the repercussions resulting from police involvement in community affairs. Moreover, I consulted with various members of the community, such as neighbors, clergy, city officials, before making a decision to intervene. I also took a series of time-consuming and potentially hazardous steps toward resolving the matter by negotiating directly with the burglars. My final decision was my own; however, it was influenced by these sources of information and approval in the community.

The decision to have the burglars arrested was required after discussing the matter with (and receiving the "go-ahead" from) various community leaders to fulfill my citizen-obligation as a special guest-member of the community. It may appear odd to sound apologetic for having burglars arrested; however, had the "hard core"[2] burglars been the focus of my study (with explicit or implicit trust established) these same actions would have been inappropriate, if not immoral. Pragmatically, I wanted my notes and slides back and I had taken

all of the conceivable steps required short of this final decision. The risk-benefit approach was inconsequential at this point given that the portion of the community involved in the study had decided to risk any retaliation for the "greater good of the community." The respect-for-persons ethic was inappropriate to apply to the burglars given that no bond of trust had been established with them. The respect-for-persons ethic was applicable, however, to the traditional segment of the community, given that a strong bond had been created with religious and social leaders, teachers, students, and various families in the community. The decision appeared logical and appropriate; however, there are "no hard and fast rules to be laid down [for these types of moral dilemmas in fieldwork]; these are matters of conscience rather than of science" (Beattie 1965:55).

At a recent professional meeting, I was asked whether I thought there was an ethical problem regarding the use of my uncensored fieldnotes by outsiders in this case. I explained:

If you had asked me what I thought if I had delivered uncoded, uncensored fieldnotes to the federal government I would agree there would have been a problem of breach of trust or confidence. However, the case of fieldnotes being stolen during fieldwork from a locked car is another matter. Given the fact that the notes were stolen, not deliberately disseminated, the fact that the burglars had no use for the materials (exept extortion) and the lengths I went to retrieve the notes, I do not feel that an ethical dilemma exists regarding this facet of the incident.

The experience of being burglarized and extorted provided me with an insight into the turbulence that most of the neighbors experience daily. Moreover, deciding to take an activist role extended my understanding of the community simply by expanding my contact with the community. Intervention in this case provided a number of extremely important data bases that were tapped throughout the study. The staff and students in the school were upset about the experience and generously offered their assistance. A number of students with street contacts helped me to identify the location of the burglars. The positive reaction of the staff and students in the school to this dilemma served to strengthen rapport. The cost of these insights, however, was extremely high. The cost is human suffering, which "is the lowest price that decent human beings must be willing to pay in order that they stay competent at the vocations of policework and fieldwork" (Klockars 1979: 277).

The Ethnographic Report

Fieldwork conducted in highly political settings can be more dangerous than fieldwork in the streets of the inner city (Diamond 1964; Peattie 1968). One of the most common mediums for interaction in the political realm is the report. An ethnographic report rich in detail is as potentially dangerous as it may be helpful, depending on how the material is presented and who uses the information. Tobin's Ph.D. dissertation, for example, "The Resettlement of the Enewetak People: A Study of a Displaced Community in the Marshall Islands" (1976), represents a classic case of misused information. Tobin's study was used by the Air Force as a resource document for preparing a misleading environmental impact statement regarding the Pacific Cratering Experiments (PACE) project. This area was

to complete my objectives.[7] (See Beattie 1965; Klochars 1974; and Wax 1971 for discussion of similar guilty knowledge experiences.)

Dirty Hands and Guilty Knowledge: Burglary and Extortion

Urban fieldwork requires both direct and indirect involvement with criminals. Polsky explained that

in doing field research on criminals you damned well better *not* pretend to be "one of them" because they will test this claim out . . . [moreover,] before you tell a criminal who you are and make it stick, you have to know this yourself, know where you draw the line between you and him (1967:124-125).

During one of my site visits to these alternative high schools for dropouts my car was burglarized and my clothes and notes stolen. The burglars then attempted to sell me my stolen possessions. In this case the line was easy to draw between the researcher and the criminal because the criminals were neither acquaintances nor participants in the study. They were simply criminals. This episode provided another case for intervention in the field (Gallin 1959; Gallagher 1964; Gearing 1973; Holmberg 1958; McCurdy 1976; Spradley 1976). The potential for producing deleterious results has been documented (Horowitz 1965; Sahlins 1967; Berreman 1969; Holmberg 1954); however, this instance illustrates how intervention with dirty hands can provide useful data for the research endeavor.

The event began at the end of a long day of interviewing at the school. I had just completed an extra interview to get ahead of my self-imposed timeline for the week and was satisfied with the week's work. I said goodbye to everyone for the day and walked down the block to my car. The window was broken, the battery removed, my suitcase and my briefcase stolen. My briefcase contained my notes and slides of my work for the two preceding weeks on site, as well as a completed paper to be presented at a professional meeting and a paper in progress.

I was stunned. Neighbors in the community who knew me came out of their houses to see the damage. One woman said her daughter had seen the burglars: two young men who had "been terrorizing the neighborhood for months." I asked for their names and Corina (pseudonym) declined to respond, explaining:

My kids, they go to that school. They would be put in danger. I try to run a good Christian home but I'm afraid of the revenge for my girls. They could get hurt by the other kids. You know.

I explained that I understood. I called for assistance from the neighborhood grocery store. No cab would come to the area so I had to wait for the tow truck to pick up the car and take me out of this part of the city. I stayed with the car to protect it from the car parts "vultures" until dark. Corina invited me into her house at dusk explaining, "It gets bad at night, especially since you're White and all. You'd be safer in here with us till the man comes." I immediately accepted her invitation and we talked about the community for a few hours. She explained how these "thugs" had held a gun to her friend's head and stolen her stereo. She explained:

They had the gall to do that and tell her when she got another one

they'd be back for that one. A year later, sure enough. She moved about a block away and they came back and stuck a gun to her head again and said it wouldn't be the last time.

Corina also told me about arson-for-hire in the neighborhood. She told me about the time she

woke up to a phone call at two in the morning. The man over the phone said to be out of the house in 15 minutes because it was going to burn. That's what they do when it's arson, they call you just like that at two in the morning. I had my rollers on and I was in my bathrobe, that's all I had. I was on the second floor and my grandma she was on the third. I can still remember seein' the flames all around her in her wheelchair. I tried to get her out but I couldn't. I had rheumatic fever, you know, so I'm weak. She was so heavy I just couldn't. I got my babies out but she was so heavy. I just watched her die. I still go to the county [psychiatrist] even now. I dream about it. It still frightens me. I couldn't save her.

Her moving story was cut short by the arrival of the tow truck. The burglary experience had already provided an opportunity to learn more about the community and develop a rapport with another member of the community. I met with Corina the next day to continue our talk about life in the inner city. She said she would be willing to serve as a mediator between the young men (burglars) and myself. She knew their mother from the PTA and agreed to meet with her to "rescue" my papers. Corina and her husband frequented one of the burglar's homes in an attempt to come to an agreement regarding my materials. During negotiations, however, one of the little girls in the burglar's home opened a curtain dividing the rooms and Corina's husband saw his color television set—stolen from them six months before. They forgot about my problem and "blew up" at the mother for condoning this behavior. Needless to say neither their television nor my materials were recovered. That evening, however, Corina volunteered to serve as a witness if I wanted to go to the police. I thanked her and told her I would have to ask a few other people in the community before contacting the police. I had been in the community off and on for over a year and a half, and feared police reprisals if the police were asked to become involved. I discussed the matter with neighbors, community action groups, members of clergy, and city officials directly associated with the community before taking any action. They unanimously agreed that "something must be done to stop these punks from having the run of the community." They suggested that I involve the police and I agreed. I contacted the police and their first response was "forget it . . . it will just end with a bullet anyway." I later learned that burglary was a low priority in an area where murder, rape, and arson were the norm. Later they said that if I felt it was necessary, I should pursue it myself.

One of the burglars then contacted Corina and told her he was willing "to negotiate" with me. I was told to wait in the school at night until he called. I observed much about night life in the inner city while I waited for his call. A crowd of young men drinking and smoking gathered outside the school, growing and dwindling in size and volume all night long. I had to check on my locked (replacement) car every 15 minutes to prevent it from being stripped to the frame. A well-dressed young man in a new Cadillac, however, did not have the same concerns. He parked his car in the middle of the street with the motor running and the radio playing loudly, while he disappeared into the darkness of the school playground with a small box under his arm. He came back empty handed 15 minutes later and drove away. No one had touched his car.

nographer is busted for drug possession on one of his first site visits." My discomfort was compounded by two policemen walking by viewing the exchange. The policemen saw the transaction, smiled and continued walking. When I asked my friend why they didn't bust us he said, "they don't need the money right now." I asked him to clarify his response and he explained:

They only bust you if they need the money. They get paid off regular. But if they're hurtin' for money then well, that's another different story. They'll come right in and bust ya, take money out of the cash register and take your dope too. If they're on a run and they gotta show that they mean business then they'll bust your ass. Otherwise they just look the other way.

My informant's words echoed a modern version of William Foote Whyte's racketeer in his classic *Street Corner Society:*

The cops are paid off. They call it the "union wage." The patrolman gets five dollars a month for every store on his beat that sells numbers. The plain clothes men get the same, but they can go anywhere in Cornerville (1943:123).

After being initiated by this brief encounter with criminal activities and official corruption, I continued to learn a great deal about the environmental pressures that affect the dropouts' behavior. My conclusions paralleled Whyte's when he reported:

Observation of the situation in Cornerville indicates that the primary function of the police department is not the enforcement of the law but the regulation of illegal activities (1943:138).

Moreover, I was faced with a number of ethical dilemmas involving guilty knowledge (incriminating information made privy to the field-worker) and dirty hands (a situation from which the field-worker can not emerge innocent of wrongdoing), which required a series of immediate decisions. First, a researcher must decide whether the research merits involvement in criminal activities. Students of deviant behavior must discriminate among the range of activities involved and decide which specific activities justify their involvement. These preliminary considerations are routinely based on a utilitarian ethic:[4] Do the ends justify the means? For example, the "in the name of science" position would argue that the insights gained during this involvement contributed to knowledge, which outweighs the short-term legal and moral transgressions. Soloway and Walters (1977:171-172) described a fieldwork episode in which one of them was made an unwitting party to the execution of an armed robbery. This behavior was considered too cavalier for some colleagues; however, his research was "breaking invaluable ethnographic ground" in the study of heroin addicts. The pursuit of research, however, is not above the law.[5] The researcher must be willing to suffer the consequences of such involvement. Personally, the researcher must balance the potential significance of the research against the severity of the criminal behavior involved. This is a useful guide in moral decision making. Alone, however, this overly rationalistic risk-benefit approach is at best off target when making moral decisions in the field.

A second question that emerges from this experience is, What is the researcher's civic responsibility after observing or inadvertantly being involved in criminal behavior? In this case, three illegal acts were involved: selling illegal drugs, buying illegal drugs, and police corruption. The researcher technically has a conflicting set of responsibilities to the student in this case. This student is a former dropout who has reentered "the system." Condoning his behavior in this case may represent a criminal type of benign neglect (see Yablonsky (1965). Protecting the student from himself, however, is condescending at best and a breach of confidence at worst. Similarly, although the researcher has an obligation as a citizen to report illegal activities, informing on the drug dealer involved would have constituted a breach of confidence—and posed a considerable threat to one's plans for an extended longevity. Moreover, the researcher must acknowledge that like prohibition, the punishment may not fit the crime and a form of nonviolent civil disobedience may be appropriate. Fundamentally, however, the respect-for-persons position overrides all of these risk-benefit considerations. The respect-for-persons position is essentially a code that "holds that there are certain means which are deontologically repulsive and in se wrong"[6] (Klockars 1979: 267). In this case, a breach of confidence would constitute "deontologically repulsive and in se wrong" means.

Finally, the third act, police corruption, is of some significance. The idea of tackling such a problem may appear insurmountable. In addition, like the other acts, it is at least outside the scope of the work that must be accomplished in a short period of time. It is important to explore such important variables in the social equation; however, the researcher must maintain some boundaries on the research endeavor if the task is to be completed.

Risk-benefit analysis, respect-for-persons ethic, and basic pragmatism are all appropriate approaches that must be taken into consideration when making moral decisions during fieldwork. As Klockars has stated, however,

the good end of the dirty means . . . is not the long term good of science, nor the potential value of the particular research at hand, and certainly not the worldly benefits continuation of that research may have for the researcher's career. It is the immediate, morally unquestionable, and compelling good end of keeping one's promise to one's subjects. In particular, it is the keeping of that minimal promise which every fieldworker makes explicit or implies to deviant subjects in the process of gaining first-hand access to their deviance (1979:275-276).

My response to this experience was not to intervene. I recorded the event in detail to provide background material regarding the various inner-city pressures operating on the students. I chose this route because it was early in the research endeavor and much more information was needed to understand how the community operated, and how my actions would affect all participants. In addition, a more active role would have constituted a breach of confidence—a confidence which in and of itself I was obligated to uphold. In turn, this breach would have served as a barrier to all future communications. This parallels Pelto's position that

any interference by the fieldworker [in this type of situation] would mean that he would have to violate the confidences of his informants, and this would seriously jeopardize his work (1970:222).

A description of police corruption, however, was printed in the report to provide the environmental context. The matter was also discussed with city officials on the researcher's own time. I temporarily separated research from activism. My reactions were based on timing, a trust, a professional responsibility to respect the environmental norms or rules and regulations until the dynamics were understood, and a responsibility

from all sides. Taking sides (purposely or inadvertently) early in the research erects barriers to communication with rival groups (see Berreman 1962). First and foremost, however, the anthropologist's responsibility lies with the informant at the center of the research task—in this case the student. The anthropologist must respect the informant's rights and maintain an intricate web of obligations, including confidentiality and reciprocity. The anthropologist must maintain his or her perspective within this convoluted structure and remember that the central informant's rights must take priority according to personal and professional ethical codes, if we are to continue to work with informants, as Mead said, "in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect" (1969). In addition, this position serves to protect future anthropological endeavors.

This juggling act becomes more difficult with the addition of another party. The ethnographer is also responsible to the taxpayer. Supporting the federal or state bureaucracy (a representative of the taxpayer) is often an unpopular position. An "agency relationship with the state" is created when a researcher accepts government funds. The state assumes both legal and political liability for the actions of the researcher in this relationship. The researcher who enters into a binding contract, in return, has an obligation (contractual and ethical) to fulfill his or her commitment to the sponsor. This includes following the evaluation design of the study (unless amended or modified), pursuing research and presenting findings with the sponsor's interests guiding the research, and being fiscally, administratively, and academically accountable to them. In a Weberian[3] sense, these relationships force one to conclude that "the occupational structure of modern science makes research, ethically speaking, a 'political vocation' " (Klockars 1979:264).

In conventional ethnography, for example, it is not unusual to scratch one's line of inquiry and select another topic and mode of investigation based on informants' information. This usually occurs when the anthropologist is alerted that there is a more pressing or appropriate research concern in the area. In contract research, however, the sponsor and researcher establish the topic and mode of inquiry before entering the field and leave little room for alteration. This is not to say that the study design is cast in stone. Information gathered from field experiences is taken into consideration and may suggest that alternative methods are required to answer the study's policy questions. Field information, no matter how compelling, however, is rarely considered sufficient to drop one's topic of investigation—political pressures are the most powerful force in this regard.

This is not a call for blind obedience or an abdication of one's responsibilities to ensure that research is conducted properly regardless of political pressures. Nor is this discussion aimed at absolving the researcher from a commitment to informants and colleagues. This discussion is presented to stress an obligation that receives little attention at best, and outright condescension at worst.

Fieldwork in the Inner City

Another problem for the anthropologist is urban fieldwork. Fieldwork in the inner city poses many challenges morally and physically. Poverty, powerlessness, political corruption, racial tensions, violent assault, and vandalism represent the backdrop of fieldwork in the inner city. The pressure of these daily activities alone generates considerable personal stress in an urban field-worker. This stress can affect one's judgment regarding data collection and ethical decision making. When researchers are confronted with such activities as police corruption, large-scale drug transactions, burglary, and extortion, they are forced to make serious ethical decisions. These decisions can be guided by a cost or risk-benefit approach (Reynolds 1979:69–84), a respect-for-persons ethic (Mcad 1969), or a simple pragmatic manner. A few cases drawn from my urban fieldwork, as well as others', are presented below. The examples are followed by a brief discussion of one or two of the plethora of ethical issues involved in each case.

Guilty Knowledge and Dirty Hands: The Front

During the early period of fieldwork it is important to establish rapport with informants. This involves presenting oneself and one's aims in as honest and direct a manner as possible. In addition, it involves time. The ethnographer must spend time with people, participating in their daily activities, working with them, joking with them, and in some cases, participating in illegal activities. Evaluating a school for dropouts requires an intimate knowledge about dropouts and their activities. Often their activities lend themselves to extralegal and periodically illegal activities. In this regard, I would concur with Polsky's sobering position:

If one is effectively to study adult criminals in their natural settings, he must make the moral decision that in some way he will break the law himself. He need not be a 'participant' observer and commit the criminal acts under study, yet he has to witness such acts or be taken into confidence about them and not blow the whistle. That is, the investigator has to decide that when necessary he will 'obstruct justice' or have 'guilty knowledge' or be an accessory 'before or after the fact, in the full legal sense of those terms' (1967:139–140).

The following is a case in point.

I became close friends with one of the students participating in the school under study. When I first met him he divided his life into two worlds—school and the street. The latter dominated his interests and activities. He was proud of his ability to thrive in the street. He had a "reputation" and was respected in his community. One of the most important elements of cultural knowledge in the street is knowing where to "cop dope." Illegal drugs and various other commodities are exchanged in the inner city in places called "fronts." Fronts are stores that sell legitimate goods such as records, health foods, shirts, and so on, as a front for routine illegal drug transactions.

My friend introduced me to this element of street life with a "hands on" approach. He invited me out for a bite to eat after school. We walked down the main street of the inner city for a few blocks until he pointed to a health food store. He said he thought that I would want to eat there since I was from California. We entered the establishment and my friend asked the clerk to give me a granola bar. I said thanks and I reached for the bar. The patron handed it to me with a smile and a small envelope underneath it. I looked down at a "nickel" bag of marijuana. My first reaction was "how am I going to look and how is ethnography going to look to my company if their eth-

research specifications required by the sponsor. Typically, ethnographers are hired to conduct fieldwork for a portion of the study. Participant-observation may range from five years to 100 hours on-site, depending on the nature and priority of the task and on the funding. (See Fetterman 1982a regarding the current role of ethnography in educational contract research.)

The ethical dilemmas explored in this discussion were based primarily on my experiences as a contract ethnographer in four separate evaluation studies: a study of alternative high school programs for dropouts, a study of gifted and talented education, a migrant education study, and an arts education contract.

Entrance into the Field

Entering the field of educational evaluation as an evaluator represents one of the first problems encountered by the ethnographer. The experience is similar to the hazards of entering the field in a foreign culture. The ethnographer must establish him or herself in an unknown and potentially hostile environment. In contract research it is not uncommon for the ethnographer to participate in a series of harrowing interviews paralleling Clinton's description (1975). The next step in this initiation is the corporation's rites of passage. This can range from frustrating methodological discussions to a routine exchange of ritual insults regarding the difference in fields. The last stage, much like a conventional employment experience, involves "proving oneself" in this precarious role as a competent researcher and employee, for example, gathering reliable and valid data, working under pressure, and constructively working with colleagues.[2] This process is evidenced in a portion of an ethnographer's recommendation. According to the director:

Stanley (pseudonym) was hired by ABC research corporation to work as an ethnographer. . . . He entered a somewhat hostile environment in that most other members of the staff had rather strong quantitative biases and were suspicious of qualitative approaches. Despite this inauspicious set of circumstances, he quickly established himself as a valued member not only of the project team, but of the entire office. He became well liked on a personal basis and well respected as a professional (President, ABC Research Corporation, 1982).

Anthropologists must determine from the onset if their values and temperament are suited to weathering those preliminary challenges. The consequences of being ill prepared or personally unsuited for such a role can be devastating to the profession as well as for the individual.

These trivial but personally draining difficulties are overshadowed by the problems resulting from conflicting expectations with sponsors. Sponsors have become increasingly aware of the strengths and weaknesses of ethnography in evaluation. Many sponsors, however, have been lured by ethnography's reputation for "finding out what's going on," without understanding what it is, or more to the point, what it is not. For example, a request for a proposal may specify the use of ethnography, the proposal may specify the use of ethnographic techniques, and upon award of the contract the project officer may expect a priori closed questionnaire-type interview protocols—with statistical correlations. These expectations may represent useful approaches in other studies; however, these

expectations do not meet the realities of ethnographic research. A sponsor's acceptance of a proposal is a binding contract and it marks the formal entrance of the field-worker into evaluation. Ethnographers entering such an agreement must recognize that the two parties may have differing sets of responsibilities and expectations. It is both the ethnographer's and the sponsor's responsibility to resolve these conflicts in a manner that serves each party's pragmatic interests without compromising the methodological integrity of the agreement.

Role Conflicts

A major problem for the anthropologist in the field is being viewed stereotypically as an evaluator (Everhart 1975; Colfer 1976). The stereotypic concept of an evaluator as someone looking for problems or deficiencies effectively blocks many communication channels. Since the ethnographer is interested in finding out how the system works from the insider's perspective, such barriers to communication must be broken down. The problem was illustrated dramatically during a site visit when personnel wouldn't speak to the site visitors, believing them to be spies. Colfer (1976), Clinton (1976), and Thorne (1980) have reported similar experiences.

The anthropologist-evaluator is faced with more than the methodological dilemma of data collection in the field. The ethnographer must function as an intermediary between informants and sponsors, informants and the research corporation, and between informant and informant. One of the most serious ethical dilemmas that emerge from working in this setting is the development of conflicting roles and interests.

Even in unusually benign instances the field researcher must be very sensitive in his presentation of self and management of social interactions. In most cases, though, the fieldworker encounters social complexities and problems at every turn, and successful role maintenance demands great presence of mind, flexibility, and luck ·(Pelto 1970:200).

Politics further compounds these role maintenance problems. The ethnographer is required to play many roles in the political context of contract research. These roles confer many responsibilities.

Conducting research in a recent national evaluation illustrated the complexity of these relationships and the diversity of roles required to function in this setting. The ethnographer conducted research in the street, the classroom, student and community members' homes, public schools, the program's local and national disseminating organizations, city governments, the research corporation, the governmental managing agency, and the sponsoring agency. Each of these levels have conflicting groups within each strata—for example, student, teacher, and principal in the school level. As Klockars (1977: 219) explained:

The problem of conflicting role obligations in biomedical experimentation, where researcher-subject and physician-patient dilemmas arise, has been highly troublesome to attempts to develop ethics for biomedical research. However, such problems do not begin to approach the complexity of conflicts and reciprocal obligations and expectations characteristic of anthropological or life history fieldwork.

It is difficult to maintain a rapport with rival groups unless one establishes oneself as an independent entity sensitive to each party's concerns, and interested in collecting information

Guilty Knowledge, Dirty Hands, and Other Ethical Dilemmas: The Hazards of Contract Research

DAVID M. FETTERMAN

Field-workers encounter numerous personal and professional hazards in contract research. A few potentially hazardous situations include entrance into the field, role conflicts, fieldwork in the inner city, ethnographic reports, and dissemination of findings. Job stress and burnout pose an additional problem. Urban fieldwork in particular forces an ethnographer to confront the realities of guilty knowledge—confidential knowledge of illegal activities—and dirty hands—a situation from which one can not emerge innocent of wrongdoing. Developing moral decision-making guidelines is imperative if one is to deal effectively with these problems. The risk-benefit approach, the respect-for-persons ethic, and basic pragmatism must all be used as guidelines in the field. Other hazards range from fieldwork conducted at an accelerated pace, to reporting in a highly political atmosphere. Many of these pressures affect one's judgment while in the field—whether in the streets of the inner city or in plush conference rooms with governmental officials in Washington, D.C. Ethnographers can adapt to most of these environmental pressures if they are aware of them. The ethical dilemmas generated in day-to-day interaction between sponsor, researcher, and informant warrant close examination.

FIELD-WORKERS ENCOUNTER MANY PERSONAL and professional hazards in contract research. A few of the situations that can prove hazardous include entrance into the field,[1] role conflicts, fieldwork in the inner city, ethnographic reports, and the dissemination of findings. Job stress and "burnout" pose additional problems. Urban fieldwork, in particular, forces an ethnographer to confront the realities of guilty knowledge (Polsky 1967)—confidential knowledge of illegal activities—and dirty hands—a situation from which one cannot emerge "innocent of wrongdoing" (Klockars 1979:271). Like Klockars (1969:265), "I personally have little use for the kind of moral study which seeks to understand how angels should behave in paradise and do not intend this analysis to be a contribution to that literature." Implicit in this discussion is that good field-workers are both "competent at

their vocations and decent as human beings" (Klockars 1979: 265). Moreover, as a colleague has expressed, a field-worker can only "act morally and responsibly if one knows the situation and understands the actors." Ethical dilemmas generated in the day-to-day interactions between sponsor, researcher, and informant warrant closer examination. "When only outstanding and scandalous cases are defined as matters for ethical concern, then the daily perplexities, interactions, and decisions occurring in the field may well be perceived as merely 'personal.' Ethics then becomes an academic subject, consisting primarily of abstract concepts counterposed by shocking violations" (Cassell 1980:42). A review of these issues serves to guide researchers in this growing field. Moreover, it is hoped that this discussion will be reflexive, encouraging field-workers in various fields to reevaluate their own roles in the pursuit of research.

David Fetterman is a senior member of Stanford University administration. He is conducting qualitative evaluations, appraisals, and audits of academic and business departments at Stanford University. Concurrently, he is a guest lecturer in the Anthropology Department and the School of Education, and serves as a consultant at RMC Research Corporation, a Bay Area educational evaluation firm. The author is indebted to Michael H. Agar, Carl B. Klockars, and Ned Polsky for producing works that have greatly influenced his thoughts and actions in moral decision making in the field. The author is also indebted to G. D. Spindler, G. K. Tallmadge, and D. S. Waxman for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. The National Institute of Education, the State of California's Office of Planning and Educational Research, and Stanford University have provided generous support for the research projects referred to in this discussion. Appreciation is also extended to Corina and her two girls for their contribution to this fieldwork. The views expressed in this article are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the policy of any agency or institution with which the author is associated.

Context

The hazards discussed in this review were based on my experience as an ethnographer in a Bay Area contract research corporation for the last four and a half years. This corporation is typical of many modern research corporations in that it is part of a corporate conglomerate of unrelated industries. The mechanics of daily routine are typical of most research corporations. The personnel in a research company respond to governmental requests for proposals, gather the appropriate expertise, and write proposals to compete with other firms for the same research contracts. (See Fetterman 1982b for a detailed description of research corporation life.)

Ethnographers are hired by research companies to provide a qualitative insight into proposed research and to fulfill