Lise M. Dobrin*

Training for ethical linguistics: a model for building "responsible conduct of research" into department culture

Abstract: What aspects of a linguist's work should be covered in training for ethical linguistics? Are they specific to the study of language? Specific to the treatment of research subjects? Specific to the practice of research? Having a clear answer is a necessary first step in planning an effective ethics education program. Related questions are which institution(s) should take responsibility for it and what settings will be most conducive to ethical learning. Should training take place in the classroom, the research lab, the department, professional society meetings? Inspired by the "Responsible Conduct of Research" U.S. regulatory framework, this article presents an approach to department-level ethics education that moves beyond individual compliance and instead has as its goal the cultivation of a next generation of linguists who are able to identify and respond to the ethical issues that arise in all aspects of the work that they do.

Keywords: disciplinary ethics; ethics education; regulatory ethics; research ethics; responsible conduct of research

1 Introduction: ethics for a diverse discipline

The contemporary discipline of linguistics is intellectually diverse. Linguists study an enormous range of topics, and they do so from diverse theoretical and methodological vantage points. They work alone and in teams. They produce data ranging from audio and video files to EEG data to systematically elicited grammaticality judgments. They build and query databases. They study speech sounds, vocabulary, grammar, semantics, language variation, and processes of change. They study specific languages and relate the patterns they find to the human cognitive capacity for language. Their methods range from computational modeling to running regression

*Corresponding author: Lise M. Dobrin, Department of Anthropology, University of Virginia, Brooks Hall, PO Box 400120, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4120, USA, E-mail: dobrin@virginia.edu. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8012-0111

analyses to notebook-and-pen documentary fieldwork in rural villages. Linguists make recordings, transcribe and analyze speech, conduct physiological and psycholinguistic experiments in controlled settings, develop software, and collaborate with communities to support language reclamation and educational initiatives. They study language in spoken, signed, written, and whistled forms. They scrutinize eye gaze, gesture, joking, metaphor, and song. They take interest in the utterances of children, adults, elders, neurodiverse, and queer individuals, and mono-/bi-/multi-linguals. They study the language of people from all backgrounds, situating the patterns they document at individual and societal levels. Because using language is part of virtually everything people do, there is hardly a human activity in which there would be nothing of interest for linguists to study. And every one of linguists' topics, methods, data types, and research situations carries along with it a distinct configuration of ethical considerations and potential pitfalls.

Furthermore, like people trained in other disciplines, linguists do many things besides conduct research: they lead multifaceted professional lives. Those in academic positions teach in settings from community colleges to online classes to university seminars. In that capacity they structure their classrooms and issue student grades. They teach at different levels, advising undergraduates on their programs of study and giving career advice to graduate students. They sit on committees, evaluate their colleagues, run meetings, and write reports. They supervise staff and teaching assistants. They advocate for their programs within and beyond their institutions and participate in hiring decisions. They write funding proposals, journal articles, and books; they review and edit proposals and manuscripts written by others; and they manage grants. They accept and extend lecture invitations. They attend conferences where they share their work and give feedback to colleagues. They respond to calls from journalists seeking comment on matters of current interest. The responsibilities of linguists who work in professional settings outside academia are so varied they are even more difficult to summarize.

What can it possibly mean to provide "training for ethical linguistics" given the enormous diversity of what linguists do? The rest of this article will attempt to provide a meaningful answer. But before doing this it will help to more carefully consider the two terms "linguistics" and "training" that the question presupposes.

2 Ethics for *linguistics*?

It might seem self-evident that the domain of an ethics training program for linguists should be the research-related aspects of linguistics. Indeed, the very existence of the present publication suggests that there is a substantive common denominator that all linguists share that brings into play an associated array of ethical norms and

concerns (though the paragraphs above are meant to raise doubts about that prospect). This question of how the domain should be construed for purposes of ethical guidance and education was one that vexed the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) when, for the first time in the society's history, it chose to take responsibility for addressing ethics as part of its mission. In 2006, an informal advocacy group coming out of that year's meeting of the Society's Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation (CELP) proposed to the LSA Executive Committee that the Society take a leadership role in regard to ethics. (The matter arose in CELP at that time because of the new attention that was being paid to linguistic fieldwork in endangered language linguistics.) The proposal, which I helped compose, was that the LSA strive to cultivate a reflexive discourse within the discipline about the kinds of ethical issues that arise in linguistic research. The executive committee responded by establishing a standing ethics committee, and the LSA adopted its first Ethics Statement a few years later, in 2009.[1]

But between those two moments was a significant process delay while the relevant constituencies contemplated and debated whether an LSA ethics statement should address what I jotted down in my notes during a phone meeting at the time as "normal ethical conduct not specific to the field". On the one hand, if people in all fields need guidance on matters such as peer review, mentoring, data management, and so on, then one could argue that it is unnecessary to include them in a discipline-specific ethics statement. On the other hand, if the LSA was the main professional society to which linguists belonged, then that is where they would be looking for guidance on matters of ethics in all areas, not just those that pertained to their research. In the end the latter position prevailed, and the Ethics Statement that was issued included text addressing linguists' responsibilities to students, colleagues, and the public. These dimensions were elaborated further in the 2019 revision, which reflects the changing times and takes the perspective that being an ethical linguist involves whole persons in all their capacities (LSA Ethics Statement, Section 2):

> It is the responsibility of linguists, individually and collectively, to ensure that we uphold the ideals and principles of equality and anti-discrimination in our professional interactions – in our language and in our behavior, on a personal level, in our interactions with others, in our institutional roles, and in our academic commitments […]

> Furthermore, these responsibilities […] apply to all settings where linguists conduct their work – such as regular workplace settings, both live and digital, field settings in which many linguists train and work, and other settings associated with professionally-sponsored programs

---

1 The LSA issued a significantly revised version of the Ethics Statement in 2019. It can be found online at https://www.lsadc.org/lsa_ethics_statement. The original version is archived at https://www.lsadc.org/Files/Advocacy/200905_Ethics_Statement.pdf.

and activities (e.g. meetings, publications, honors and recognition, governance programs, and all appointed, elected, and volunteer positions).

The question the LSA Executive Committee pondered is important because before one can even begin to think about what "training for ethical linguistics" might look like, it is critical to clarify the boundary between what properly belongs inside the work we do "in linguistics", as opposed to what can be safely ignored as beyond its scope.

Most instructive in regard to that boundary are two major ethics crises that troubled the LSA (and the field of linguistics more widely) in recent years. In 2017, following accusations that University of Rochester language scientist Florian Jaeger had a history of harassing women,[2] the LSA was urged to set up a task force on misconduct that resulted in the Society adopting a code of conduct for all LSA meetings, institutes, and other Society-sponsored events.[3] In 2020, as part of the public outpouring of fury over the murder of George Floyd at the hands of the Minneapolis police, the LSA was again called upon to act in the name of ethics; an open letter to the LSA with over 600 signatures demanded that the Society remove Dr. Steven Pinker from its roster of distinguished fellows and media experts. The letter presented instances of social media posts going back over nearly a decade in which Pinker seemed to be using his professional authority to downplay racist violence in defense of an unjust status quo. In response, the Society convened two more task forces, one to revisit its process for inviting (and un-inviting) Fellows, and another to establish explicit policies and procedures for endorsing public experts (see Kastner et al. 2022 for a timeline and summary of what transpired).

These cases of controversy are interesting because the ethical breaches they raise – sexual harassment, speaking publicly in a way that seems to minimize the seriousness of societal racism – have nothing to do with linguistics as such. Nor are they related in a direct way to the conduct of research. Rather, they are about the ethics of wider professional life for those committed to "doing linguistics".[4] Given the prominence and importance of these challenging cases, it seems that the LSA was on the right track when it constructed its Ethics Statement to apply to the more expansive understanding of "linguists" as a professional identity category, rather

---

2 See https://www.campustimes.org/2017/09/18/nationwide-professors-concerned-urs-handling-jaeger/.
3 The original version of the conduct policy is archived at https://www.lsadc.org/Files/Advocacy/2017124_Civility%20Policy.pdf.
4 Over fifteen years of service on the American Anthropological Association's ethics committee and in related roles have taught me that this is not peculiar to linguistics: the ethical conflicts that trouble anthropologists also overwhelmingly involve publishing, relations with colleagues and employers, control and ownership of data, mentoring, and other more general aspects of professional life.

than "linguistics" as a topic of research. I endorse this understanding, and in the remainder of this article it is what I will assume.

3 Ethics *training*?

In the United States and Canada, linguistics students often receive their first introduction to ethics education in the form of university training focused on the protection of human subjects, the individuals whose speech, bodies, and actions provide data for answering researchers' questions. For researchers to work ethically with people in this capacity means (at minimum) safeguarding their welfare: seeing to it that the harms incurred by participants are minimized, that their consent to participate is properly informed, and that they understand and limit the circulation of any data that identifies them. In the United States, human subjects protections are overseen by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs); in Canada this responsibility is held by Research Ethics Boards (REBs). IRBs and REBs are administrative bodies meant to ensure compliance with national ethics regulations.[5] These in turn operationalize more general ethical principles like *respect for persons* (respecting individuals' right to make choices for themselves), *beneficence* (striving to do good and avoid harm), and *justice* (fairly distributing exposure to risks and access to benefits of research).[6]

   Although high-level ethical principles such as these are worthy aspirations, it is doubtless imperfect to manage adherence to them through a legalistic system focused on auditable actions like data storage practices and creating records of informed consent. Many have argued that the humans subjects regulatory framework is a flawed means of ensuring the ethical quality of work in the humanities and social sciences (see, e.g., Brydon-Miller and Greenwood 2006; Lederman 2006; Schrag 2011; van den Hoonard and Hamilton 2016).

   Also problematically, the prominence given to human subjects training in formal ethics education means that ethics is often encountered by novices as a matter of regulatory compliance, i.e., a monitored following of pre-established rules. This has some unfortunate repercussions. There is a danger that compliance-related concerns "eclipse

---

5 US **Code of Federal Regulations** Title 45 **Part 46 ("The Common Rule") and its** 2018 revision (https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/45-cfr-46/index.html); the Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2): https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2022.html. In Europe, such role is often taken up by national committees under the guise of either national research councils or the government directly. The situation in different parts of the world is more variable than can be adequately summarized here.

6 These principles are famously enshrined in the US Belmont Report: https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html.

the contemplation and discussion necessary for responsible disciplinary practice" (Dobrin and Lederman 2012), as anxieties about gaining research approval understandably dominate students' experience. Associating ethics with rules separate from the researcher and the research situation – an approach sometimes referred to as *deontological* ethics (Alexander 2021), *procedural* ethics (Guillemin and Gillam 2004), or in the literature on applied linguistics, *macro-ethics* (Kubanyiova 2008) – means that formal institutional approval can come to be taken counterproductively as a proxy for ethical research itself. Furthermore, in order to ease the administrative burden of compliance tracking, many North American institutions in the U.S. provide training in the form of online modules, which are too easy to complete and then forget.[7]

Compliance-oriented ethics training makes sense if the point is making sure researchers know and agree to follow a set of rules. Of course, it also makes sense from the point of view of institutions eager to protect themselves from potential lawsuits. But it is far from adequate for preparing members of a community of practice to exercise ethical judgment in all aspects of their professional activities throughout their careers. It is inadequate, in other words, for the cultivation of a generalized ethical sensitivity, practical wisdom (Luckman and Gunsalus 2023), or as one European research ethics handbook puts it, ethics as "a state of mind" (Pauwels 2007: 20). For that, an entirely different approach is called for, one that is more akin to socialization into ways of being – habits of reflection, discourse, and behavior – than it is to following rules. A recent exploration of how researchers understand the development of professional integrity suggests a process not of training but of "sensitization" to acting with integrity, something that arises out of past (especially early) experience and exposure to role models both positive and negative (Satalkar and Shaw 2019: 6). The purpose of systematic ethics education would be to reinforce and further develop this ethical sensitivity.

4 Responsible conduct of research: a broader framework for ethics education

Focusing training on human subjects regulations is problematic not only because of its emphasis on rule following. It is also too limited in scope, as it draws learners' attention to only a narrowly defined fraction of the ethics-related challenges they are

---

7 Readers in the U.S. may be familiar with the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) Program, which "offers an easy to manage turnkey solution that organizations can use to train entire groups of learners affordably" in human subjects regulations (https://about.citiprogram.org/advantages-for-organizations/). Online training in the Canadian regulations is provided at https://tcps2core.ca/welcome.

likely to face in their capacity as professionals: as discussed above, recent public ethics controversies in linguistics have centered on the relation between researchers and one another and the relation between the profession of linguistics and society at large, rather than on the way research itself was being carried out.

But there is another set of regulations that I believe *can* be built upon to play a useful role in structuring ethics education because it is capacious in content and less restrictive in its compliance requirements. In the late 2000s, a group of U.S. federal agencies began requiring that institutions plan to "provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research" to students and post-doctoral scholars involved in sponsored research.[8] The term generally applied to these regulations is "Responsible Conduct of Research" or "RCR". The regulations require that institutions seeking funding from the relevant federal agencies – which include the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA NIFA), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) – attest that their researchers have been provided with training in RCR. Although I will be focusing specifically on the U.S. regulatory framework in this article, documents with similar coverage have been issued in the time period since then by international bodies such as the World Conferences on Research Integrity (WCRI) and the All European Academies (ALLEA).[9]

RCR is concerned very broadly with ensuring that researchers will be ethical actors in the social world. In addition to human subjects protections, the domain of RCR covers conflicts of interest; mentor-mentee relationships; collaborative arrangements of different kinds; the peer review process; data management, sharing, and rights; misconduct; authorship and publication; and societal impacts of research. The full listing of RCR subject matter from the most recently issued guidance is presented in (1).

(1)   Topics that fall within the scope of RCR instruction according to 2022 NIH guidance.[10]

---

8 See NSF "Important Notice No. 140 Training in Responsible Conduct of Research – A Reminder of the NSF Requirement" (https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/issuances/in140.jsp).

9 See, for example, the 2010 Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (Kleinert 2010) as well as its further elaborations, especially the 2013 Montreal Statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations and the 2022 Cape Town Statement on Fostering Research Integrity through Fairness and Equity. All the World Conferences on Research Integrity guidance documents can be accessed at https://www.wcrif.org/. Similar in spirit is the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA 2023) which updates the two previous statements (2011, 2017) produced by ALLEA's Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics.

10 See NIH notice NOT-OD-22-055 (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-22-055.html). The topics are meant as recommendations, and not as an exhaustive list demanding full coverage. The regulations' authors seem to have understood that "research integrity holds many more intellectual challenges than can be expressed through [any list of] federal standards" (Heitman 2023: 182).

- conflict of interest – personal, professional, and financial – and conflict of commitment, in allocating time, effort, or other research resources
- policies regarding human subjects, live vertebrate animal subjects in research, and safe laboratory practices
- mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships
- safe research environments (e.g., those that promote inclusion and are free of sexual, racial, ethnic, disability and other forms of discriminatory harassment)
- collaborative research, including collaborations with industry and investigators and institutions in other countries
- peer review, including the responsibility for maintaining confidentiality and security in peer review
- data acquisition and analysis; laboratory tools (e.g., tools for analyzing data and creating or working with digital images); recordkeeping practices, including methods such as electronic laboratory notebooks
- secure and ethical data use; data confidentiality, management, sharing, and ownership
- research misconduct and policies for handling misconduct
- responsible authorship and publication
- the scientist as a responsible member of society, contemporary ethical issues in biomedical research, and the environmental and societal impacts of scientific research

The RCR framework is valuable not because it is an alternative regulatory system that improves upon the human subjects protections system (though it is, and it does), but because it takes an expansive view of what should be covered in ethics education. For example, the issues raised by the ethical controversies discussed in Section 2 above would be addressed under RCR topic categories (c) mentor/mentee relations, (d) workplace harassment, and (k) scientists' societal responsibilities. The kinds of questioning taking place as I write this about the role of faculty and students in rejecting their university employers' entanglements with other institutions that are argued to be causing harm (i.e., calls for divestment) would likewise be discussed under the category of the scientist as a responsible member of society (k).

While the U.S. RCR policy imposes no particular requirements for formal RCR instruction, the associated guidance documents do provide recommendations for best practices.[11] The primary educational format should involve substantial

---

11 See NIH notice NOT-OD-10-019 (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not-od-10-019.html).

face-to-face discussions. These can be supplemented by video-based formats so long as they are "utilized in a way that fosters discussion, active learning, engagement, and interaction among the participants" (NOT-OD-22-055). Online courses are explicitly rejected as an adequate method of RCR education (NOT-OD-10-019). The participants in formal ethics education should include not only students or "trainees"; mentors should also contribute, whether as presenters, discussion leaders, or course organizers. (As many RCR experts have observed, the involvement of faculty members or other senior professionals signals that RCR is a core community value; see, e.g., Anderson 2016; Bird 2012.) In order to support the consolidation of learning, RCR education activities should be distributed over an extended period of time like a semester or year, as opposed to a single intensive time-compressed event, and they should involve at least eight contact hours. Structured ethical reflection on RCR topics should ideally occur at every stage of education and career, from undergraduate research assistants all the way up to the faculty level.

In an insightful programmatic article that I urge anyone interested in ethics education to read in its entirety, Michael Kalichman argues that "the primary goal of RCR education [should be] to foster a research culture in which conversations about responsible conduct of research are expected and acceptable" (2014: 69). Focusing on building an ethically engaged community implies a very different educational approach than the compliance-oriented "training" discussed earlier. While there are certainly rules to be learned (not only about human subjects but also about animal care and use, data management, and conflicts of interest), the ethical issues that arise in the course of a linguist's professional life will rarely be straightforward breaches of regulations and policies; they will almost always call for navigation of ambiguity, uncertainty, competing pressures, and divergent points of view. Ethical sensitivity and alertness can keep linguists from stumbling into "questionable research practices" (QRPs), ill-advised but not always premeditated choices (such as over-budgeting on grant proposals, cherry-picking data, retrofitting hypotheses to suit the results, excessive self-citation, etc.) that threaten the ethical integrity of the research process at every stage, even if such practices do not rise to the status of outright misconduct (Plonsky et al. 2024).[12]

The topical coverage of any RCR education curriculum will necessarily be incomplete; after all, research trajectories and careers often take unexpected turns, and even when they don't, it is impossible to anticipate the kinds of situations that any one of us will ultimately confront. There is a reason we so often marvel to ourselves that "life is stranger than fiction"! Kalichman makes the point that *the real*

---

12 QRPs in the handling of quantitative applied linguistics data are discussed in Isbell et al. (2022); lesson plans and materials for teaching about QRPs in applied linguistics are presented in Wood et al. (2024).

entity subject to positive transformation through successful RCR education is in any case not the individual participants or "trainees", but rather the wider community to which they belong. That community includes everyone affected by research along a spectrum of roles from students to society at large, and it will include areas of professional life that extend beyond the narrow practice of research: How often, and in what kinds of settings, should mentors meet with their mentees? Which factors are appropriate to consider in determining the order of authors on a publication deriving from a joint project? For how long is it justifiable to embargo one's dissertation data? How can workplace diversity be created, supported, and sustained? An advisory report on RCR education recently issued by the Association for Practicing and Professional Ethics (APPE) advances a perspective in very much this same vein (APPE 2024).

5 Building a culture of ethical engagement at home

The APPE report just mentioned offers detailed strategies for furthering the interests of four major stakeholders in the research ethics ecosystem: funders, research institutions, accreditation bodies, and professional associations. One of the report's key recommendations for research institutions is that they "provide and encourage participation in appropriate, tailored, and engaging RCR training for all who are engaged in research" (APPE 2024: 6). The tailoring they seem to have in mind involves differentiation according to disciplines. They call for "abandon[ing] the 'silver bullet' myth […] that one type of intervention serves all fields equally" and instead encourage "the development of discipline-specific topics and education experiences", welcoming the assistance of professional societies in doing this (APPE 2024: 6). Specialists in ethics education are broadly in agreement that RCR programming should vary by discipline and address issues "identified by experts within the fields themselves" (Bulger and Heitman 2007: 877; see also Field et al. 2024). But while I completely agree that any generalized RCR education program is likely to be insufficiently tailored, whether for linguistics or for any other field, a discipline-specific ethics education program does not improve on this as much as it might seem at first blush. After all, there are simply too many ways of "being a linguist" (or a sociologist, an environmental scientist, or whatever) to be confident that even a discipline-specific program will target the relevant issues for everyone who participates.

Nevertheless, *to the extent that linguists are socialized into their professional identities in their home graduate departments/schools/programs, a degree of discipline-specificity will follow naturally if that is where ethics education*

programming is developed and sited. There are certainly other settings that contribute to junior researchers' socialization into their fields of study, including individual courses, research labs, professional meetings, social media sites, and listservs. But for purposes of identity formation and professionalization, the departments where we receive our graduate education are comparable to our families of origin: even in the absence of active teaching, our home departments provide one of the earliest professional settings into which we are actively incorporated; it is in them that we learn how to interact with others in our capacity as emerging linguistic researchers and practitioners. We learn which of our seniors and peers to admire, what kind of questions are legitimate to pose, what professional success and failure look like, and how conflicts are handled (and hopefully how they are resolved). Departments constitute a formative social space where the values of a disciplinary culture are acquired.

5.1 The department workshop model

There are many formats in which one could formally bring ethics education into a department. The main thing is to do so in a way that is highly visible and well-integrated into the environment, for "[i]f that environment does not foster conversations about research ethics, then the message [implicitly being transmitted there] is that it isn't important" (Kalichman 2014: 70–71). In what follows I describe the successful model of RCR education that has been followed for over a decade in my department at the University of Virginia (UVA), an anthropology department comprising three main subfields: sociocultural, archaeological, and linguistic anthropology.[13] The program was developed with the approval of the UVA Office of the Vice President for Research as a means for complying with the NSF RCR training requirement without resorting to online coursework. The financial resources that it takes to run it are minimal, just the cost of occasional snacks.

The program is called the "Fieldwork, Ethics, and Ethnographic Writing" workshop (or as the students memorably abbreviate it, FEEW). Although the meaning of "fieldwork" varies across the participants' past, ongoing, or intended research situations, as well as across the characteristic practices of the department's three subfields, fieldwork is a mode of knowledge production to which the discipline as a whole is strongly committed; it is also one that is assumed by anthropologists to require ethical sensitivity (Lederman 2013). "Ethnographic writing" is a broad

---

13 The program described here is presented as one of seven "RCR training exemplars" in a recent report issued by the National Academies; see National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2023: 22–24).

reference to the production of research results. The term has special resonance in a discipline that has long been engaged in self-questioning about the possibilities for representing cultural others, and that has responded with keen interest to calls for researchers to realign their relations with interlocutors to be more collaborative (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Lassiter 2005). Of course, anyone aiming to establish any kind of department-wide ethics workshop will want to create a designation and focus for it that is meaningful and attractive to its own participants.

Two main features of the workshop contribute to its visibility and integration into department life. First, FEEW takes place in one of the department's regular speaker series slots, rather than as a course. This ensures that it doesn't compete with other department events in terms of scheduling while signaling that it is an event for everyone, not just for students. Students get "RCR training hours credit" by registering their participation on a sign-in sheet that is passed around at the start of each workshop, but there is no formal evaluation of students beyond requiring participation. Second, it is organized by a small group of rotating volunteer graduate student leaders working with a faculty adviser. The involvement of more than one "career stage" category in running the workshop helps construct it as a part of department life that all can be responsible for. In addition to a two-hour IRB tutorial led by one of the department's IRB liaisons, the organizing team aims to offer three two-hour workshop events each academic year, thus achieving the goal of eight contact hours suggested by the NIH guidance for RCR training. (It is, after all, meant to satisfy a regulatory requirement.).

The format varies, but it typically consists of short, informal, experience-based presentations by two to four panelists followed by full group discussion in a seminar format. Panelists include both faculty and advanced graduate students, with discussion facilitated by the faculty adviser or graduate student leaders. Whenever possible, presenters from more than one subfield are scheduled to present together. This helps provide for a diversity of perspectives and draws in participants from multiple social networks within the department. Attendance is typically around 15–20 people.

FEEW workshops are in-person, but they have also been held by videoconference when doing so made sense. For example, an event exploring ethics in archival research was held online in the 2020 fall semester, when all teaching was remote and students had to begin developing alternatives to in-person research because of the global Covid pandemic. On other occasions workshops were held by videoconference or in hybrid form in order to include remote guest presenters. FEEW workshop email announcements list the individual presenters and give a brief overview of the theme. A handful of faculty members usually show up to each workshop simply out of interest in the topic or to listen to particular presenters, but some faculty involvement is always ensured by the regular inclusion of faculty among the panelists. As

just mentioned, on occasion the workshop has featured outside presenters. An attorney from the university's General Counsel office agreed twice to present at an intellectual property workshop, and on two different occasions an editor of a top journal presented at a workshop on publishing.

As with linguistics, given the diversity and open-endedness of the discipline of anthropology, there is no way to effectively target the "right" set of topics and issues that would ideally be covered for every emerging researcher or practitioner. So rather than aiming for coverage, which would in any case be incomplete, the aim is for interest and relevance. A selection of topics addressed in past workshops is listed in (2). Some have been offered more than once, but with different presenters, slants, and groups of participants. The panelists don't usually lecture on these topics; instead, they take turns sharing stories of real-life experiences they have had that shed light on them in some way.

(2)   Some of the topics that have been addressed in the UVA Anthropology department's Fieldwork, Ethics, and Ethnographic Writing Workshop
    –   veiling versus revealing participants' identities
    –   ethical issues in archival research
    –   race and positionality in teaching and research
    –   creating and managing fieldnotes
    –   the impact of money on relationships in fieldwork
    –   logistics and ethics of journal publishing
    –   mentoring
    –   intellectual property and authorship rights
    –   long-term relationships in fieldwork communities
    –   navigating bureaucracy at home and abroad
    –   co-authoring
    –   religion and politics in the classroom
    –   considerations in the use of visual media
    –   working in teams
    –   encounters with plagiarism

Only in rare cases do the workshops cover predetermined "lessons". Instead, the lessons emerge conversationally, interwoven with insights into practical matters. For example, the most recent journal publishing workshop featured three panelists who edit or previously edited journals. They took turns speaking about their respective journals, why they volunteer to do this service, and what they glean from their experiences that they thought aspiring authors should know. Over the course of the event participants learned about the different journals' institutional arrangements and financial models (allowing for discussion of open access), the mechanics of the manuscript submission process (bringing up matters related to blinding), and

what is expected of reviewers (providing an opening to discuss confidentiality, conflict of interest, and timeliness). In the workshop on veiling versus revealing identities, one of the presenters opened by summarizing how norms regarding anonymization have changed over the history of the discipline; the panelists then explored in a nondirective way some of the challenges that arose in their work in their respective research settings: a morgue in a country beset by political violence, a small rural locality in which identities are impossible to conceal because of the density of social networks, and an equestrian center in which there turned out to be ethical reasons for concealing the identities of the animals despite this not being required by either the human subjects rules or the animal board. In the workshop on mentoring, a panel of faculty members spoke about the ambivalent experiences they themselves had had as mentees earlier in their careers.

In fact, there is really just one overarching lesson that these workshops are meant to teach: that ethical issues are everywhere and they call for alertness and engagement. The workshops contribute to a departmental environment in which ethical reflection is explicit (so conscious), relevant (so rewarding to discuss), and openly addressed as part of ongoing professional practice. The success of the approach is evident from the enthusiasm with which graduate students have embraced it. Most seem to be aware that it satisfies a requirement that allows them to apply for federal grants, but the compliance motivation is so backgrounded that students continue to attend workshops and agree to present in them even after their "training" obligation has been fulfilled. I have heard them talk about the FEEW program to prospective students during admission events, and some presented on their experiences with it when they participated with me in a roundtable session about teaching ethics at an anthropology conference. There are several roles for student volunteers in the department, and students readily volunteer to fill the FEEW positions. It is compelling to hear one's teachers and fellow students speak in an open-ended way about ethically challenging experiences they have had in different domains and how they have dealt with them.[14]

There is no reason why the department workshop model could not be adapted for linguistics (or any other discipline). Of course, those best situated to come up with an appropriate title, format, and approach to staffing and scheduling would be the local organizers. Although I use the term "department", I recognize that not all

---

14 Only rarely have FEEW events been recorded for later circulation within the department. As I discuss below, the whole point of the workshop is to bring participants into conversation about challenging topics with members of their professional community whom they know personally. Knowing that the workshop was being recorded for later dissemination would likely put limits on what participants would be willing to share and the questions they would feel comfortable asking. It would be akin to participating in a group therapy session that one knew was being recorded and would later be made public.

graduate training in linguistics takes place in departments as such; linguists are also educated in language departments (Spanish, English, East Asian Languages, etc.), interdepartmental programs, and in other institutional configurations. As with every other aspect of the workshop model presented here, identifying the right academic unit for purposes of programming should be based on the local situation. The task of doing this will not always be straightforward. For example, the relevant student body might be too large for a seminar-style event. At the same time, there is a limit to the diversity of perspectives and experiences that can be shared when the academic community drawn upon is too close-knit or highly hierarchical, as may be the case at the level of the individual research lab. The faculty involved should not be confined to the students' own supervisors.

While the curriculum should reflect the ongoing concerns and interests of the department's students and faculty, in (3) I list a few of the topic areas that emerged from discussion at the "Ethics in Linguistics" workshop sponsored by the Lorentz Center in May 2022 in Leiden, Netherlands, which formed the basis for this special issue of *Linguistics*.[15]

(3)   Some topics of ethical concern that surfaced during the 2022 "Ethics in Linguistics" workshop.
    – sharing data with other researchers
    – explaining your work to the public
    – ethics of reviewing
    – teaching as a form of activism
    – compensating research participants
    – the political economy of publishing
    – inclusion of secondary or peripheral participants in research
    – customizing the informed consent process
    – ecological sustainability
    – ethics training for community collaborators

Any of these topics could be used as a springboard for discussion in a linguistics department ethics workshop. It is interesting to note the topics' generality: not one item in the list is specific to linguistics. This is only to be expected given my earlier observations about the diversity of topics linguists study, the range of methods they use, and the many professional activities they engage in beyond research as such.

---

15 The workshop was organized by Marina Terkourafi, Felix Ameka, Petros Karatsareas, Mary Linn, and Maria Carmen Parafita Couto and included participants who were trained in different linguistic subfields, used different methodologies, and worked in different national contexts. See https://www.lorentzcenter.nl/ethics-in-linguistics.html.

Even so, discipline-specific knowledge and experiences will necessarily shape the discussion of any one of them when it takes place among linguists.

5.2 Pedagogical considerations

Before concluding I want to briefly discuss an interrelated pair of pedagogical considerations that I think make the department workshop model just described an especially powerful format for ethics education. One is the nature of the "teaching tools" used; the other is who the "teachers" are. The most common teaching tool relied upon in ethics education is the case study: a carefully composed write-up of a real, invented, or adapted scenario. Ethics cases are sometimes published with associated discussion questions that are intended to help create engagement and stimulate participants' thinking about the ethical issues at play. Case studies are readily available online[16] and are often found embedded in ethics education materials such as the standard RCR manuals *Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research* (Steneck 2007), *On Being a Scientist* (National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine 2009), or *Fostering Integrity in Research* (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2017). There is now even an app, Dilemma Game, that delivers case material in game form.[17]

But as Kalichman (2014: 74) observes, we should be careful not to confuse the method of case analysis with the goal of fostering engagement and reflection, as "[t]here are many other approaches that would help to enliven a curriculum". While well-chosen cases can be engrossing, facilitating the FEEW workshop over the years has convinced me that even more engrossing are reports of real, ethically relevant scenarios shared in conversation with individuals whom one personally knows – and gets to know more intimately as a result of the sharing. Conversationally exploring ethically complex situations that are in some way personally connected to the teller (albeit not always personally experienced by them) merges the case study with actual group problem solving, rather than leaving the situation in the realm of abstraction (Ochs and Capps 2001; Wylie 2019). Personal connection is significant because it elicits emotional involvement on the part of the learner.

Philosopher Lisa Kretz (2015, 2020) argues that the role of emotion is underappreciated in ethics education. She attributes this to a tacit "knowledge-attitude-behavior" model that wrongly "assumes that sharing knowledge inevitably leads to

---

16 See, e.g., the large collection of case studies compiled at the Online Ethics Center https://onlineethics.org/resources?combine=&field_resource_type_target_id=13236.
17 See https://www.eur.nl/en/about-eur/policy-and-regulations/integrity/research-integrity/dilemma-game.

behavior change" (2015: 158). The prevalence of this assumption is probably related to the origin of ethics in the field of philosophy, where there is an emphasis on logic and reasoning, or "ratiocination". Kretz draws upon research in cognitive science, sociology, and education that shows how "human thinking and willing operate mostly beneath the level of our conscious awareness, often involving intuitive and highly affect-laden processes" (Johnson 2014: 73, quoted in Kretz 2020: 43). "Emotions do not merely accompany our deepest desires and satisfactions, they constitute them, permeating our ideas, identities, and interests" (Jasper 1998: 399, quoted in Kretz 2020: 46). So to the extent that motivating students to contemplate, discuss, and act on ethical issues is the goal, the task for educators is not just to promote ratiocination, but to find forms of engagement that also "extend the reach of empathetic response" (Kretz 2015: 160).[18] Because they form part of a shared social group as well as a wider community of professional practice, there is no one better positioned to elicit such a response than one's own teachers and peers speaking about real experiences they have had in a candid yet officially sanctioned way. When it comes to learning about practical (as opposed to philosophical) ethics, what is needed is not access to generalized moral principles, but compelling models for how to deal with the kinds of ethically challenging situations that one could realistically encounter (Englehardt and Pritchard 2013).

6 Conclusions

Linguists are special, but they are not that special. Like researchers and practitioners in all fields, as students go through their graduate education in their home departments they become socialized to take certain kinds of problems seriously and to approach them and reason about them in certain ways. As part of this socialization, they acquire habits of speaking and writing, arguing, teaching, organizing themselves, promoting their work, dealing with conflict, and so on, that are never intentionally "taught", yet somehow end up being learned. One of the habits they can learn in this way is to bring an ethical alertness to any of the myriad things they will end up doing and witnessing in their lives as linguists, including things that are not directly tied to the conduct of research. There is no better way to cultivate this habit than to give linguistics students "the tools, resources, and motivation to engage in

---

18 Another approach to ethics education that is known for its power to generate emotion is the ethics bowl. At an ethics bowl, teams of students compete to provide carefully considered responses to cases they have been assigned (Israeloff and Mizell 2022). The difference is that in an ethics bowl, the emotion derives more from excitement about the competitive event itself than from the content of the cases. By contrast, in my experience emotion emerges for participants in a FEEW workshop from empathy with co-present others and personal curiosity about and investment in their affairs.

regular, open conversations" with their seniors and peers about the ethical issues that touch them (Kalichman 2023: 206; Kalichman et al. 2022). The RCR workshop offers a model for building ethical reflection into the social fabric of the departments where our professional identities begin to form.

References

Alexander, Larry & Michael Moore. 2021. Deontological ethics. In Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/ethics-deontological/.

ALLEA [All European Academies]. 2023. *The European code of conduct for research integrity*, rev. edn. Berlin. Available at: https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/.

Anderson, Misti Ault. 2016. Pedagogical support for responsible conduct of research training. *The Hastings Center Report* 46(1). 18–25.

APPE [Association for Practicing and Professional Ethics]. 2024. *Improving research integrity: The role of accountability across the research enterprise. Report of a national dialogue on the state of research integrity*. Available at: https://growthzonecmsprodeastus.azureedge.net/sites/36/2024/05/APPE-National-Dialogue-Report-FINAL_05212024.pdf.

Bird, Stephanie. 2012. Involving faculty in teaching the responsible conduct of research. *Teaching Ethics* 12(2). 65–75.

Brydon-Miller, Mary & Davydd Greenwood. 2006. A re-examination of the relationship between action research and human subjects review processes. *Action Research* 4(1). 117–128.

Bulger, Ruth Ellen & Elizabeth Heitman. 2007. Expanding responsible conduct of research instruction across the university. *Academic Medicine* 82(9). 876–878.

Clifford, James & George Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dobrin, Lise M. & Rena Lederman. 2012. Imagine ethics without IRBs. (Ethical Currents.) *Anthropology News* 53(2). 20.

Englehardt, Elaine E. & Michael S. Pritchard. 2013. Teaching practical ethics. *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 27(2). 161–173.

Field, Sarahanne M., Jackie Thompson, Sarah de Rijcke, Bart Penders & Marcus R. Munafò. 2024. Exploring the dimensions of responsible research systems and cultures: A scoping review. *Royal Society Open Science* 11. 230624.

Guillemin, Marilys & Lynn Gillam. 2004. Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2). 261–280.

Heitman, Elizabeth. 2023. What does it mean to teach "RCR"? Historical perspectives on topics for RCR instruction. *Teaching Ethics* 23(2). 171–185.

Hoonard, Will C. van den & Anne Hamilton (eds.). 2016. *The ethics rupture: Exploring alternatives to formal research-ethics review*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Isbell, Daniel R., Dan Brown, Meishan Chen, Deirdre J. Derrick, Romy Ghanem, María Nelly Gutiérrez Arvizu, Erin Schnur, Meixiu Zhang & Luke Plonsky. 2022. Misconduct and questionable research practices: The ethics of quantitative data handling and reporting in applied linguistics. *The Modern Language Journal* 106(1). 172–195.

Israeloff, Roberta & Karen Mizell (eds.). 2022. *The ethics bowl way: Answering questions, questioning answers, and creating ethical communities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Jasper, James. 1998. The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum* 13. 397–424.

Johnson, Mark. 2014. *Morality for humans: Ethical understanding from the perspective of cognitive science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kalichman, Michael. 2014. Rescuing responsible conduct of research (RCR) education. *Accountability in Research* 21. 68–83.

Kalichman, Michael. 2023. Status of education in responsible conduct of research: Review and recommendations for RCR instructors and researchers. *Teaching Ethics* 23(2). 187–217.

Kalichman, Michael W., Mary L. Devereaux & Dena K. Plemmons. 2022. A course for teaching and learning about the responsible conduct of research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 17(3). 284–291.

Kastner, Itamar, Hadas Kotek, Anonymous, Rikker Dockum, Michael Dow, Maria Esipova, Caitlin M. Green, Elise Stickels & Todd Snider. 2022. The open letter: Responses and recommendations. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 7(1). 5257.

Kleinert, Sabine. 2010. Singapore statement: A global agreement on responsible research conduct. *Lancet* 376. 1125–1127.

Kretz, Lisa. 2015. Teaching being ethical. *Teaching Ethics* 15(1). 151–172.

Kretz, Lisa. 2020. *Ethics, emotion, and empowerment*. London: Lexington Books.

Kubanyiova, Magdalena. 2008. Rethinking research ethics in contemporary applied linguistics: The tension between macroethical and microethical perspectives in situated research. *The Modern Language Journal* 92(4). 503–518.

Lassiter, Luke E. 2005. *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lederman, Rena (ed.). 2006. AE Forum: Anxious borders between work and life in a time of bureaucratic ethics regulation. *American Ethnologist* 33(4). 477–548.

Lederman, Rena. 2013. Ethics: Practices, principles, and comparative perspectives. In James G. Carrier & Deborah B. Gewertz (eds.), *The handbook of sociocultural anthropology*, 588–611. London: Routledge.

Luckman, Elizabeth A. & C. K. Gunsalus. 2023. Beyond compliance: RCR for research integrity by embracing practical wisdom. *Teaching Ethics* 23(2). 219–239.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Fostering integrity in research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2023. *Promising practices and innovative programs in the responsible conduct of research: Proceedings of a workshop*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. 2009. *On being a scientist: A guide to responsible conduct in research*, 3rd edn. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Ochs, Elinor & Lisa Capps. 2001. *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pauwels, Eléonore. 2007. *Ethics for researchers: Facilitating research excellence in FP7*. Brussels: European Commission.

Plonsky, Luke, Tove Larsson, Scott Sterling, Merja Kytö, Kate Yaw & Margaret Wood. 2024. Developing a taxonomy of ethical decisions in applied linguistics research. In Peter I. De Costa, Amr Rabie-Ahmed & Carlo Cinaglia (eds.), *Ethical issues in applied linguistics scholarship*, 10–27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Satalkar, Priya & David Shaw. 2019. How do researchers acquire and develop notions of research integrity? A qualitative study of biomedical researchers in Switzerland. *BMC Medical Ethics* 20(72). 1–12.

Schrag, Zachary M. 2011. The case against ethics review in the social sciences. *Research Ethics* 7(4). 120–131.

Steneck, Nicholas H. 2007. *Introduction to the responsible conduct of research*. Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wood, Margaret, Tove Larsson, Luke Plonsky, Scott Sterling, Merja Kytö & Katherine Yaw. 2024. *Addressing questionable research practices in applied linguistics: A practical guide*. Applied Linguistics Press.

Wylie, Caitlin. 2019. Socialization through stories of disaster in engineering laboratories. *Social Studies of Science* 49(6). 817–838.