



## *From describing Culture to Questioning it Ethical and Methodological issues in Sociological Studies*

*Lebni Fatiha \**

*Echahid Cheikfi Larbi Tebessi University,  
Tebessa (Algeria)*

[fatiha.lebni@univ-tebessa.dz](mailto:fatiha.lebni@univ-tebessa.dz)

*Chennit Bahia*

*Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou*

[bahia.chennit@ummto.dz](mailto:bahia.chennit@ummto.dz)

### *Abstract*

*This study investigates the intricate nexus between cultural dimensions and the ethical as well as methodological challenges inherent in contemporary sociological inquiry. A nuanced understanding of cultural context is imperative to mitigate bias and safeguard the validity of knowledge claims, particularly within cross-cultural research settings. The analysis delineates the influence of cultural variability across all phases of the research process—from problem formulation and research design to trust-building and the interpretation of empirical findings. Moreover, it underscores the necessity of researcher reflexivity regarding positionality and the contextual adaptation of ethical frameworks. Through a critical-analytical engagement with sociological and anthropological scholarship, the study advances the argument that cultural sensitivity, ethical accountability, and reflexive critique constitute essential conditions for the production of responsible sociological knowledge. The findings contend that addressing these challenges requires an integrated paradigm that reconciles methodological rigor with cultural competence and ethical responsibility.*

### *Article info*

*Received*

*January 17.2026*

*Accepted*

*March 11.2026*

### **Keyword:**

- ✓ *Sociology,*
- ✓ *Cultural Dynamics,*
- ✓ *Research Ethics,*
- ✓ *Methodological Challenges,*
- ✓ *Cross-Cultural Inquiry*

\* Corresponding author

## 1. **Introduction**

Sociology, as a field of knowledge concerned with understanding and interpreting human behavior within its diverse social contexts, constitutes a fertile ground for epistemological, methodological, and ethical challenges. At the heart of these challenges lies the complex and dialectical relationship between sociological inquiry and the cultural dimensions of the societies under study. Culture—conceived as a comprehensive system encompassing beliefs, values, norms, language, and practices shared by members of a community and transmitted across generations—is not a mere background or peripheral context for social phenomena. Rather, it is a constitutive and fundamental element that imbues them with meaning and shapes their manifestations. Recognizing this centrality of culture is the point of departure for any serious sociological research that seeks to transcend superficial understandings and to produce a deeper analysis of social reality in all its complexity and diversity.

This relationship between sociology and culture acquires even greater significance in the contemporary world, characterized by intensifying intercultural interaction and overlap driven by globalization, migration, and the advancement of communication technologies.

Increasingly, sociological researchers can no longer presume cultural homogeneity within the societies they investigate, nor can they uncritically apply concepts, theories, and methodological tools

developed within a particular (often Western) cultural context without critical reflection and careful adaptation to diverse local realities. The growing awareness of cultural diversity and the risks of ethnocentrism has led to heightened attention to the ethical and methodological dilemmas inherent in conducting research within culturally varied settings or across multiple cultures.

These dilemmas encompass a wide spectrum of challenges encountered at every stage of the research process. From the moment of selecting a research topic and formulating its problematics, the researcher is influenced by cultural background and preconceptions, and the very concepts employed may hold different meanings—or none at all—in the studied culture. In designing research and choosing methodological approaches, questions arise concerning the appropriateness of quantitative or qualitative methods for specific cultural contexts, and how to ensure equivalence and comparability in cross-cultural studies. During data collection, further challenges emerge, such as the need for culturally sensitive research instruments, issues of language and translation, the difficulties of trust-building and participant access, and the negotiation of appropriate communicative and interactional norms. These challenges extend into data analysis and interpretation, where the risk of projecting the researcher's cultural assumptions onto participants' accounts is particularly acute, and into the dissemination of findings, where an ethical responsibility emerges to represent the studied culture faithfully and

to avoid stereotyping or causing harm to the community.

Such methodological challenges are inseparably intertwined with ethical concerns. Issues such as securing genuine informed consent, protecting participants' privacy and data confidentiality, assessing potential risks and benefits, and ensuring an equitable distribution of the burdens and benefits of research acquire added complexity when engaging with cultures where expectations, norms, and meanings attached to these principles differ. Moreover, the structural asymmetries of power between researcher and researched—especially pronounced in cross-cultural contexts—intensify these ethical dilemmas and demand a heightened level of reflexive awareness and a principled commitment to fairness and mutual respect.

This study aims to shed light on the sensitive and complex intersection of culture, ethics, and methodology in sociological research. It seeks to provide a critical analysis of the key issues and challenges that confront researchers in this domain, highlighting their potential implications for the quality, credibility, and ethical responsibility of sociological inquiry. To achieve this objective, the study adopts a critical-analytical approach grounded in a review of contemporary sociological and anthropological literature, the examination of illustrative case studies, and an engagement with theoretical frameworks and ongoing debates surrounding best practices for addressing these challenges.

The study proceeds from three central assumptions: first, that the absence of cultural sensitivity in sociological research constitutes a major source of both methodological bias and ethical violation; second, that critical awareness of the researcher's own positionality and its effects—reflexivity—is a necessary condition for producing responsible and reliable research; and third, that effective ethical practice in culturally diverse settings requires a careful balance between universal principles and context-sensitive application.

Against this backdrop, the study is guided by the following core research question: **How do cultural factors interact with ethical and methodological challenges across the various stages of contemporary sociological research, and what are the implications of this interaction for the credibility of sociological knowledge and the ethical responsibility of the researcher toward the studied communities?**

## ***2. The Centrality of Culture and the Challenges of Sociological Understanding***

### ***2.1 Culture as a Constitutive Dimension:***

Emphasizing the centrality of culture in understanding social phenomena is not an intellectual luxury but rather a methodological and ethical necessity for serious sociological inquiry. As Clifford Geertz defines it, culture represents the “webs of meaning” that humans themselves have spun and in which they are suspended. These webs—composed of symbols, language, values, beliefs, and

shared practices—constitute the interpretive framework through which individuals and groups perceive reality, make sense of their experiences, guide their behavior, and interact with one another and with the surrounding world. Any attempt to understand social behavior or social structures in isolation from these webs of meaning—that is, apart from culture—will be fragmentary and deficient, akin to trying to interpret a play without comprehending the actors' language or the significance of their gestures.

## ***2.2 Tension Between Generalization and Particularity:***

The centrality of culture presents profound challenges to sociology's scientific ambition of formulating generalizations and explanatory models that transcend specific contexts. Given the vast diversity of human cultures, concepts, methods, and theories that may be valid in one cultural setting cannot automatically be assumed applicable in another. This creates a persistent dilemma for researchers: on the one hand, the quest for universal patterns of human behavior; on the other, the need to respect cultural particularities and the heterogeneity of lived experiences.

### ***2.3 The Risk of Ethnocentrism***

One of the most salient challenges arising from this dilemma is the danger of ethnocentrism, namely the conscious or unconscious tendency of researchers

to adopt their own culture as the sole reference point for understanding and evaluating others. Ethnocentrism manifests itself in the assumption that the researcher's cultural norms and values are “natural,” “universal,” or “superior,” while practices and beliefs in other cultures are dismissed as “strange,” “irrational,” or “backward.” This stance not only obstructs scientific objectivity but also carries problematic ethical implications, as it entails cultural arrogance and a lack of respect for difference. Both anthropology and critical sociology have consistently warned against ethnocentrism and advocated cultural relativism as a methodological tool—that is, seeking to understand beliefs and practices within the cultural context in which they arise, without imposing premature external value judgments. Yet cultural relativism also raises dilemmas, particularly when practices conflict with fundamental human rights, thereby necessitating ongoing debate regarding its scope and limits.

## ***2.4 Implications for Research Phases***

The influence of ethnocentrism and the absence of cultural sensitivity becomes evident throughout the research process:

- **a-Problem Formulation and Conceptualization:** Researchers may impose questions or categories irrelevant—or differently meaningful—in the studied context. For instance, studies on “social integration” of migrants may reflect preconceived notions of successful

integration without considering migrants' own perceptions or the cultural standards of both sending and receiving societies. As Syed Farid Alatas has argued, the dominance of Western concepts and theories in global sociology underscores the need to generate frameworks rooted in non-Western contexts to achieve more accurate and inclusive understandings.

- **b- Data Collection:** In quantitative research, designing a culturally valid survey requires more than linguistic translation. Researchers must ensure *conceptual equivalence* across cultures, *measurement equivalence* in survey items, and awareness of culturally influenced response styles (e.g., tendencies toward acquiescence, exaggeration, or restraint). Reliance on Western-developed scales without careful adaptation risks producing distorted findings. In qualitative research, data quality hinges on building rapport with participants, which is deeply shaped by cultural norms of trust, respect, and hospitality. Knowledge of the local language—including idioms, implicit meanings, and contextual expressions—is crucial, while translation always risks meaning loss or distortion. Even participant observation, often deemed the most context-sensitive method, demands a profound grasp of cultural meanings underlying observed behaviors and interactions, as well as awareness of the researcher's own influence on the setting.
- **c- Data Analysis and Interpretation:** The challenge lies in avoiding the imposition of the researcher's

interpretive frameworks onto participants' accounts. Culturally sensitive analysis requires privileging the *emic* perspective—understanding phenomena from the viewpoint of participants themselves—while employing analytic tools that allow meanings to emerge inductively from the data. Continuous validation of interpretations, including through discussion with participants or cultural experts, is essential to safeguard credibility.

### 2.5 Toward Reflexivity and Cultural Sensitivity

Recognizing these methodological challenges underscores the need to view cultural sensitivity as a core competency for sociological researchers, and reflexivity as an ongoing practice of self-critical reflection on the researcher's positionality and its impact on the research process. The sociologist is not a neutral transmitter of knowledge but an active co-constructor of it, shaped by personal background, experiences, and values. Acknowledging this subjectivity and addressing it with transparency and critical rigor enhances the credibility and trustworthiness of sociological knowledge—particularly in the study of culture.

### 3. Ethical Dilemmas in Cross-Cultural Research

The ethical principles of scientific research—primarily designed to protect participants and ensure the integrity of

knowledge production—acquire heightened complexity and urgency when research is conducted in culturally diverse or cross-cultural contexts. Variations in values, norms, and conceptions of the individual, community, privacy, and knowledge often generate genuine ethical dilemmas. These require sociologists not only to comply with formal codes and guidelines but also to exercise critical reflection and responsible moral judgment.

### 3.1 Informed Consent and Its Cultural Challenges

Informed consent is a cornerstone of research ethics. It requires that participants understand the nature, objectives, risks, and potential benefits of the study, that their participation is voluntary and free of coercion, and that they retain the right to withdraw at any time. Yet applying this principle poses serious challenges across different cultural contexts.

- The concept of *individual autonomy*—the normative basis of informed consent—may not be the prevailing or exclusive decision-making framework in collectivist cultures, where family, community, or local leaders often play a central role. In such settings, researchers may need to negotiate consent with these actors while safeguarding the individual's right to refuse or withdraw.
- The process of “informing” participants is itself culturally and linguistically mediated. Information

must be conveyed in a manner accessible to participants' educational and cultural backgrounds. Lengthy, complex written consent forms common in Western contexts may be unsuitable—or even suspicious—in communities where oral communication predominates or literacy is limited. In some cases, oral consent, appropriately documented, or the use of visual or narrative explanations may prove more culturally appropriate, provided that participants truly understand the research and its implications before granting consent.

### 3.2 Assessing Risks and Benefits Across Contexts

The principle of beneficence requires careful balancing of potential risks against anticipated benefits, in ways that are contextually sensitive.

- What appears to the researcher as “minimal risk” (e.g., temporary embarrassment or time loss) may have greater social, psychological, or economic consequences in settings where reputation, honor, or community standing are highly valued, or where resources are scarce. For instance, discussing culturally taboo topics might expose participants to stigma or social exclusion. Similarly, disclosure of certain information—even if anonymized—

could harm the collective reputation of tightly knit communities.

- The notion of “benefit” itself varies. While the researcher may prioritize the epistemic value of new knowledge, participants may not perceive this as meaningful. Researchers thus bear responsibility for ensuring that research offers tangible or indirect benefits to participants and communities, whether through disseminating findings in accessible ways, contributing to community needs, or engaging in reciprocity. This requires open dialogue with community members to understand their perspectives on risks,

### 3.3 Justice and Power Relations:

The principle of justice—requiring fair distribution of the burdens and benefits of research—raises critical questions in cross-cultural contexts marked by asymmetrical power relations.

- Exploitation risks arise when knowledge is extracted from local communities without yielding meaningful returns or proper acknowledgment of their contributions, especially in relation to traditional knowledge systems.
- Researchers from dominant or global centers (e.g., from developed countries studying communities in the Global South, or majority-group researchers studying minorities) must remain acutely aware of these

imbalances. Ethical responsibility demands building more equitable, participatory research relationships that respect community rights, recognize intellectual contributions, and ensure that communities share in the benefits of research outcomes.

### 3.4 Privacy, Confidentiality, and Representation:

Norms and expectations around privacy and confidentiality differ widely across cultures.

- In small, tightly knit communities, guaranteeing anonymity may be extremely difficult. Researchers must negotiate appropriate forms of protection with participants, aligned with cultural norms and expectations.

- Beyond data protection, researchers bear profound ethical obligations in representing participants’ voices and experiences with accuracy and integrity. This entails avoiding stereotyping, overgeneralization, or misrepresentation, and carefully considering the potential consequences of publication for both individuals and communities.

### 3.5 Toward a Reflexive Ethical Sensibility:

navigating these complex dilemmas requires more than adherence to abstract guidelines. Researchers must cultivate a finely tuned ethical sensibility—a capacity for critical reflection in concrete

situations, openness to dialogue and consultation with peers, participants, and community members, and flexibility in applying ethical principles with cultural sensitivity. Only through this reflexive, contextually informed practice can sociologists uphold both the integrity of research and their ethical responsibilities toward the communities they study.

#### **4. Methodological Challenges in Light of Ethical and Cultural Practices**

The commitment to ethical principles and cultural sensitivity is not merely a moral obligation for the sociological researcher; it also has direct and profound implications for the methodological quality and credibility of research. Ethical decisions made by the researcher, and the ways in which cultural contexts are addressed, inevitably shape the design of the study, data collection, analysis, and ultimately, the findings. Ethical and culturally sensitive practice can thus be regarded as a prerequisite for sound methodological practice in sociological research, particularly in diverse contexts.

##### **4.1 The Impact of Ethics and Culture on Research Design**

This influence begins at the stage of research design and methodological choice. The pursuit of justice and community participation may lead researchers to adopt Participatory Research approaches, where community

members are actively involved in formulating research questions, designing tools, collecting data, analyzing results, and disseminating findings. Although such approaches pose practical challenges, they can enhance the contextual relevance of the research, strengthen trust and cooperation, and mitigate asymmetrical power relations. Furthermore, awareness of cultural differences may guide researchers toward employing Mixed Methods, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to produce a more comprehensive understanding of the studied phenomenon. Qualitative data, for instance, may help contextualize and interpret quantitative findings, and vice versa.

##### **4.2 The Impact of Ethics and Culture on Data Collection**

During data collection, ethical and cultural considerations present clear methodological challenges. Securing genuinely informed consent requires culturally appropriate and effective communication strategies to explain the research and ensure comprehension—often demanding more than a mere signed form, and sometimes requiring additional time and effort. Ensuring privacy and confidentiality may call for innovative measures adapted to the specific social relations of the studied community, alongside transparency regarding the limits of such

confidentiality. Building rapport with participants, crucial for obtaining honest and in-depth data (particularly in qualitative research), largely depends on the researcher's respect for cultural interaction norms, demonstration of genuine concern, fulfillment of commitments, and avoidance of any behavior perceived as exploitative or disrespectful. Failure to establish such trust due to ethical or cultural insensitivity inevitably compromises data quality.

#### **4.3 The Impact of Ethics and Culture on Data Analysis and Interpretation:**

Data analysis and interpretation represent a critical stage where the interplay between methodology, ethics, and culture becomes most evident. Faithfully representing participants' voices requires context-sensitive analysis that attends to the meanings participants assign to their own experiences, while avoiding the imposition of external or reductionist interpretations. This often involves the use of in-depth qualitative methods and member checking as part of ensuring validity and ethical credibility. Reflexivity becomes particularly important here, as researchers must continually interrogate how their own backgrounds, assumptions, and positionalities may shape interpretations, and remain transparent about such influences. Analyses that ignore cultural context or impose rigid

interpretive frames risk being not only methodologically weak but also ethically problematic if they distort participants' realities or misrepresent their cultures.

#### **4.4 The Impact of Ethics and Culture on the Presentation and Dissemination of Findings:**

Ethical and methodological responsibility extends into the stage of writing and disseminating research findings. Researchers must present results in a balanced and accurate manner that respects participants and communities, avoids overgeneralization or stereotyping, and transparently acknowledges methodological and ethical challenges encountered. Reports should include reflexivity statements, reflecting critically on the researcher's positionality and potential influences. Moreover, dissemination should not be confined to academic journals; researchers must also consider ways of sharing findings with studied communities in accessible and beneficial formats, in line with principles of reciprocity and giving back.

#### **4.5 Toward a Culturally and Ethically Responsible Sociological Methodology**

The discussion above demonstrates that pursuing high-quality sociological research in culturally diverse contexts requires moving beyond the conventional separation of

methodology, ethics, and culture. Instead, an integrated approach is needed—one that views these dimensions as interdependent and mutually shaping across all research stages. Such an approach demands that sociologists develop the following competencies and commitments:

- **Methodological competence:** Mastery of diverse quantitative and qualitative methods, and the ability to adapt them appropriately to research contexts and questions.
- **Cultural awareness and sensitivity:** Deep understanding of the cultural context of the studied community, respect for its values and norms, and the ability to communicate and interact effectively across cultural differences.
- **Ethical commitment:** Adherence to fundamental ethical principles, combined with the wisdom and sensitivity to apply them appropriately in concrete situations, prioritizing participants' well-being and rights.
- **Continuous reflexivity:** Ongoing critical reflection on the researcher's positionality, assumptions, and potential biases.
- **Commitment to participation and reciprocity:** Building equitable and collaborative research relationships with communities, and ensuring that research produces tangible benefits for them.

Achieving this integration is far from straightforward; it requires sustained training, critical reflection, and conscious practice. Yet it offers a pathway toward producing sociological knowledge that is not only more accurate and credible scientifically but also more responsible, just, and human-centered—capable of genuinely contributing to a deeper understanding of our complex and diverse world.

## **5. Sociology and Ethics**

### **5.1. Background:**

Mid-twentieth-century sociology was largely dominated by structural functionalist approaches. This paradigm interpreted society through a structural lens, emphasizing how different social institutions interact to maintain order and allow society to function. Critics argued, however, that structural functionalism reinforced the status quo, offering insufficient critique of inequality and systemic disparities.

By the 1970s and 1980s, critical perspectives gained prominence. Marxist theory was revitalized as a source of critique capable of driving social transformation, while other critical paradigms emerged—such as symbolic interactionism and feminist sociology—highlighting sociology's capacity to interrogate social problems critically. Research increasingly focused on marginalized groups, systemic racism, and social inequalities.

Howard Becker (1967) epitomized this shift, urging sociologists to challenge "credibility hierarchies" by treating individuals—especially those from marginalized groups—as experts of their own lived realities, rather than privileging institutional or elite narratives. Ethical sociology, in this sense, became a practice of amplifying marginalized voices and confronting power imbalances.

Parallel to these disciplinary developments, biomedical ethics rose to prominence in response to atrocities such as Nazi experiments and the infamous Tuskegee syphilis study, in which African American men were denied treatment to allow researchers to observe disease progression. Likewise, psychology produced ethically controversial experiments such as Milgram's obedience studies (1960s) and Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment (1970s). These cases prompted institutionalized ethical oversight.

Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) emerged first in biomedical research, later extending to social sciences. Yet the imposition of biomedical models on sociological research introduced challenges. In contexts of heightened legalism, informed consent protocols often became overly bureaucratic and alienating, particularly in research with vulnerable populations such as illiterate participants. Critics argue that such frameworks reflect biomedical

colonization of social science ethics, constraining the flexibility needed for culturally sensitive, community-based sociological research.

### 5.2. *Key Issues: Power Dynamics and Bias in Fieldwork and Surveys*

When entering the field, sociologists — whether conducting qualitative or quantitative research — must acknowledge their social positioning and the privileges or biases they carry. As Scott Grills (2018) notes, power hierarchies cannot be fully erased: researchers retain authority as observers, just as professors retain authority in classrooms despite efforts to equalize dynamics. Simultaneously, participants exercise agency in deciding what to disclose, how to represent themselves, and where to allow access.

Bias is deeply embedded in these dynamics. While reflexivity and rapport may mitigate distortions in qualitative contexts, survey-based research often obscures bias in instrument design and question framing, making it harder to detect. Thus, ethical concerns about bias remain central across methodologies, underscoring the importance of reflexivity.

### 5.3. *Reflexivity*

Reflexivity has become a cornerstone of ethical sociological practice. It requires researchers to critically interrogate not only their biases but also their impact on the field, the questions posed, and the relationships built with participants. Reflexivity is especially salient in

qualitative research, where trust-based relationships are essential.

Researchers working as "insiders" face unique ethical dilemmas when transitioning between roles of community member and researcher. Ethnographic accounts (e.g., Spradley 1979; Van den Hoonaard 2012) emphasize humility, consultation, and learning from participants as experts of their own lives. Reflexivity also addresses the "betrayal anxiety" of representing participants' stories in ways that could compromise trust.

Since the 1970s, reflexivity has been further developed by feminist and Indigenous methodologies, both of which highlight trust, accountability, and the centrality of everyday lived experiences. Dorothy Smith (2010), for instance, introduced institutional ethnography to link local experiences with broader organizational structures, arguing against universalist abstractions. Similarly, Indigenous methodologies insist on contextual, trust-based research practices, developed partly in response to exploitative histories of anthropological and sociological engagement with Indigenous communities. Indigenous research frameworks—such as Nunavut Research Institute guidelines or the San Code of Research Ethics in South Africa—exemplify locally grounded ethical governance, foregrounding reciprocity and shared humanity.

**5.4. Community-Based Research (CBR)**  
Community-Based Research (CBR) has gained traction across sociology, anthropology, and applied fields such as nursing. Defined as a collaborative approach involving equal partnership

among researchers and community members, CBR prioritizes co-creation of knowledge and translation into actionable policies or interventions.

While promising, CBR raises its own ethical questions: Who legitimately represents the community? How do researchers navigate power asymmetries between elites and grassroots members? What happens when community leaders' agendas conflict with marginalized voices? Such dilemmas highlight Becker's enduring question: "Whose side are we on?" Despite challenges, CBR has proven rewarding, empowering participants, amplifying silenced voices, and producing more socially responsive knowledge.

#### **5.5. Ethics Beyond Research:**

Ethical responsibility extends beyond data collection into dissemination and post-research engagement. Trust-based relationships demand continuity: researchers should consider how results are communicated back to participants and communities, ensuring accessibility and reciprocity.

Some sociologists share publications directly with participants, while others facilitate follow-up discussions to allow participants to respond to findings—even when those findings are uncomfortable or critical. Annette Lareau (2014), for example, allowed participants to append statements to her book, thereby institutionalizing reciprocity and transparency.

Ultimately, sociology's ethical commitments encompass the entire research trajectory—from design and fieldwork to publication and beyond—grounded in respect, accountability, and

recognition of participants as co-constructors of knowledge.

### 6. *Current Debates: Ethics Review*

Current debates in sociology about ethics increasingly engage with feminist and Indigenous methodologies. Yet, much of the discourse has shifted away from substantive ethical practice toward discussions of Research Ethics Boards (REBs) and how they operate. These boards, critics argue, often obstruct social science inquiry, distort good research practices, and sometimes even push scholars away from studying marginalized populations most in need of attention. The influence of positivist and biomedical thinking continues to shape how sociologists engage with their work.

Michael Lynch (2000) expresses deep concern that the dominance of REB-related issues eclipses genuine ethical debate. He stresses that certain institutionalized systems of ethics review threaten reflexivity, one of sociology's most distinctive epistemological strengths.

This is a multifaceted problem. A generation of scholars risks emerging without the capacity to critically interrogate REBs and their histories. In many contexts, sociologists exhibit passivity toward these systems, accepting bureaucratic rigidity as inevitable. For scholars concerned with ethics, this trend is alarming, as REBs shape how we conceptualize research at its most fundamental levels.

The preoccupation with navigating review processes—often detached from the substantive ethics of social research—

turns sociologists' attention inward. Instead of asking what constitutes ethical practice in relation to participants, they ask how to ensure a project passes review. Ethical review boards create new hierarchies of credibility, placing themselves at the top, followed by the researcher as expert, and participants at the bottom.

Participants thus find themselves at the lowest rung of this hierarchy—even though the research is about their own lives. Researchers are compelled to assume what constitutes ethical behavior from participants' perspectives, only to filter these assumptions through biomedical models. This reduces ethics to cost-benefit calculations ill-suited to social science. Researchers are positioned above their participants, undermining reflexivity and creating ethically problematic practices.

The undermining of reflexivity by REBs has far-reaching consequences. Sociologists are treated as untrustworthy professionals, while boards themselves become legitimized and entrenched—feeding into a billion-dollar compliance industry. The biomedical imprint is visible in required terminologies such as “protocols” and “minimal risk.”

The term “subject” has been especially problematic. Unlike “participant,” which aligns better with social science ethics, “subject” emphasizes asymmetrical power and grants privilege to the researcher. This undermines entire areas of inquiry, such as participatory research and community rehabilitation. Language shapes how researchers perceive their role: shifting

from humility and learning to self-importance and authority. While researchers bring methodological expertise, participants are the true experts of their own lives—requiring the researcher to begin from a learner’s position.

Some scholars counter that “subject” and “participant” denote different relationships. In some studies (e.g., interviews), participation is active; in others (e.g., covert observation), individuals may not participate knowingly and could legitimately be considered “subjects.” For covert ethnography, the unit of analysis is often the scene rather than individuals. While debates over terminology continue, most agree that ethical treatment of participants—or subjects—remains paramount.

Traditional consent practices in social sciences are often undermined by REBs. Signing a consent form does not equal genuine informed consent. Consent practices cannot be standardized across diverse field sites and cultures, as meanings of “risk” and “harm” are symbolically and culturally constructed. In marginalized communities, introducing consent forms can even be unethical. In La Guajira (Colombia and Venezuela), for example, historical trauma makes formal consent forms inappropriate.

Elsewhere, participants may sign out of fear, deference to authority, or discomfort. For oral cultures, written consent can be disrespectful, leaving permanent records that participants may find unsettling. Alternatives—such as oral consent—can be more culturally appropriate.

Consent forms can also undermine trust. Sociologists work hard to build rapport, only to introduce a legal document protecting institutions rather than participants. This dynamic signals distrust and erodes relationships. In elite settings, such as research with physicians, consent forms may even be perceived as offensive. As many scholars argue, “consent forms signify neither consent nor permission.” They can cause harm, heighten power imbalances, or create embarrassment—ironically violating the very ethical principles they intend to uphold.

Another issue arises in determining who can be studied. While many populations report positive experiences from participation, REBs often restrict research on vulnerable groups, such as children, despite their need for scholarly attention. Faculty and students alike may avoid such populations to sidestep bureaucratic hurdles. Innovative methods are also stifled when boards impose ill-fitting biomedical logics on social science.

## **7. Future Issues: Covert Research**

Concerns about covert research loom large in current debates. Medical research abuses in the past have made covert research deeply suspect, leading many ethics boards—even those overseeing social science—to reject it outright. Yet covert methods have historically been central to sociology, allowing scholars to observe social life without disrupting its natural flow.

Patricia Adler’s (1993) research on drug cultures illustrates the value of covert ethnography. By immersing herself in this

world, she preserved anonymity and safety while collecting rich data through fieldnotes and informal conversations. Her work exemplifies ethical engagement without requiring formalized, potentially harmful consent mechanisms.

Covert observation may often be the only way to understand social dynamics “at rest.” For instance, attending fraternity parties without disclosure could reveal insights into gender relations, dating violence, and student drinking cultures. Demanding prior permission would likely render such phenomena invisible. Restricting covert research thus risks intellectual and social stagnation.

## 8. Online Research and Privacy

As digital life becomes integral to social life, sociologists face novel ethical dilemmas in online research. Social media provides abundant data, but questions of access, consent, and privacy remain unsettled. Should digital spaces be treated as public or private? How should scholars reconcile online and offline conceptions of “space”?

Further challenges arise in data anonymity. Even when identifiers are removed, verbatim online quotes can be traced through simple searches. Moreover, all online data are inherently mediated, raising complex questions about authenticity, representation, and responsibility. As digital technologies expand, so too will sociological ethical dilemmas

## 9. Proposed Solutions

Several proposals address these ongoing conflicts. Some advocate dissolving REBs for social science altogether, while others propose decentralized, department-level review systems more attuned to disciplinary needs.

In 2012, an ethics summit of sociologists produced *The New Brunswick Declaration*. Developed through consultative consensus, it outlined alternatives to current regulatory regimes. Among its principles: institutions should cultivate a culture of respect for researchers, mirroring the respect researchers owe participants.

At its core, the declaration insists that ethics—whether among researchers, participants, or regulators—must always be grounded in trust-based relationships.

## 10. Research Findings

### 1. *The cultural dimension is critical to sociological inquiry.*

Understanding cultural context is essential to avoid bias and ensure the credibility of knowledge, particularly in cross-cultural research. Any study that disregards cultural context risks producing superficial or distorted results. Concepts and tools developed within one cultural framework may not be directly transferable to another without adaptation. Researchers must remain attentive to differences in language, symbolic meanings, and behavioral patterns to construct a comprehensive understanding of social phenomena.

### 2. *Universal ethical principles require careful contextual adaptation.*

Ethical norms such as informed consent or data confidentiality cannot be uniformly applied across cultures. Collective values, traditions, and local practices may redefine the meaning of “autonomy” or “privacy.” This calls for flexible interpretation and active collaboration with local communities to determine the most appropriate ethical approaches.

### 3. *Ethnocentrism poses a methodological and ethical threat:*

When researchers assume their own values and standards are “universal” and use them to judge other cultures, they compromise the objectivity of their

findings. Such bias leads to flawed conclusions, normative judgments, and weakens the ability to represent studied communities fairly.

**4. *Ethical and methodological challenges are deeply intertwined:***

Any failure in one domain directly undermines the other. For instance, if trust (rapport) is not established with participants, data will likely be superficial or distorted. Likewise, poor ethical awareness may result in the use of culturally inappropriate tools, which compromises research validity.

**5. *Continuous reflexivity is essential:***

Researchers must consistently reflect on how their own cultural backgrounds and assumptions shape the research process. Reflexive practice reduces unconscious biases and enables more balanced interpretations, thereby enhancing transparency and trust in sociological knowledge.

**6. *An integrated approach is required:***

The optimal way to confront cultural and ethical challenges is by combining methodological rigor, cultural sensitivity, and ethical commitment. Researchers need diverse skills: designing culturally responsive tools, engaging deeply with local contexts, and applying ethical values flexibly and responsibly. The absence of any of these elements weakens research as a whole.

## **11. *Research Conclusions***

Drawing from the critical analysis of literature and practices concerning sociological research in diverse cultural contexts, this study reaches several key conclusions regarding the complex interplay of cultural, ethical, and methodological dimensions:

**1. *Centrality of culture:***

The study confirms that the cultural

dimension is not an auxiliary factor but a fundamental element permeating all aspects of social phenomena and the research process itself. Ignoring or oversimplifying cultural dynamics inevitably produces distorted understandings of social reality, methodological biases, and severe ethical shortcomings. This supports the first hypothesis: neglecting cultural specificities undermines both methodological integrity and ethical responsibility.

**2. *Inevitability of researcher positionality.*** The findings demonstrate that the positionality of sociologists—shaped by their cultural background, social identity, and personal experiences—inevitably influences research at every stage: from topic selection and question formulation to fieldwork interactions, data collection, and interpretation. This validates the second hypothesis that positionality requires continuous reflexivity and transparency to strengthen research credibility.

**3. *Tension between universal ethics and local contexts.*** The study highlights the tension between general ethical principles (autonomy, beneficence, justice) and their application across diverse cultural settings. Rigid adherence to universal norms may be inappropriate or even harmful in some contexts, whereas uncritical reliance on local norms may justify practices conflicting with basic human rights. This confirms the third hypothesis: ethical principles must be consciously adapted in a way that balances universality and specificity, requiring ongoing ethical deliberation.

#### 4. Complex methodological challenges:

Cross-cultural diversity introduces a wide range of methodological difficulties: ensuring conceptual and measurement equivalence in comparative research, adapting data collection tools (surveys, interviews), addressing response biases, navigating language and translation barriers, building trust in the field, and avoiding interpretive bias in qualitative analysis.

#### 5. Need for an integrated, critical approach.

To address these interwoven challenges, sociologists must adopt an approach that combines methodological competence, cultural awareness, ethical sensitivity, and continuous reflexive critique of themselves and their practices. Promising strategies include participatory research, mixed-methods approaches, and collaborative cross-cultural partnerships.

Ultimately, these conclusions underscore that meaningful and responsible sociological research in today's culturally diverse world demands high levels of epistemological, methodological, and ethical commitment. Acknowledging the complex interplay of culture, ethics, and methodology is a prerequisite for advancing fairer, more credible, and socially relevant knowledge.

## 12. Conclusion

This study examined the intricate intersections of cultural, ethical, and methodological challenges in

contemporary sociological research. It demonstrated that recognizing and respecting cultural diversity is not only an ethical imperative but also a methodological necessity for producing valid and credible knowledge.

The analysis revealed that superficial engagement with cultural specificities inevitably distorts social realities, generates methodological bias, and risks ethical violations. Researcher positionality was shown to be a decisive factor requiring ongoing reflexivity. The tension between universal ethical norms and local practices highlights the need for flexible, context-sensitive adaptation without abandoning the core protection of human dignity and rights.

The study also identified specific methodological challenges arising from cultural diversity in both quantitative and qualitative approaches, from research design and measurement equivalence to data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

The central conclusion is that effective sociological research in multicultural contexts requires an integrated approach: methodological rigor, deep cultural awareness, strong ethical grounding, and critical reflexivity.

Looking ahead, future research should:

- Develop practical guidelines to help researchers navigate ethical and methodological dilemmas in culturally specific contexts (e.g., Indigenous or refugee communities).
- Conduct empirical studies to assess the effectiveness of culturally adapted research tools.
- Expand theoretical debates from non-Western perspectives to

enrich sociological epistemology.

- Explore researchers' lived experiences through reflexive and narrative approaches to enhance collective learning.

Sustaining this interdisciplinary and cross-cultural dialogue is essential to strengthen sociology's capacity to address the complexities of our contemporary world and to contribute to building more just, inclusive, and culturally sensitive societies.

### **Bibliography List :**

1. Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books. New York-USA
2. Alatas, S. F. (2006). The Autonomous, the Universal and the Future of Sociology. *Current Sociology*, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi ,54(1), 7–23.
3. Hammersley M, & Atkinson P, (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis group, New York-USA.
4. DeWalt, K. M., & DeWalt, B. R. (2010). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Publishing, London UK.
5. Marshall, P. A. (2007). "Cultural Competence" and Informed Consent in International Health Research. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 16(3), 206–219.
6. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
7. Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261–280.
8. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed*

*Methods Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications ,USA .

9. Jacobs , Sue-Ellen, (1980) Where have we come? *Soc Probl* 27: 371–378.
10. Irvine JM (2012) Can't ask, can't tell: how institutional review boards keep sex in the closet. *How Insitutional Review Boards Keep Sex In The Closet Sage journals, Contexts* 11(2): 28–33
11. Loftus EF (2008) Perils of provocative scholarship. *APS Obs* 21(5).<https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/perils-of-provocative-scholarship>
12. Lareau A (2014) *Unequal childhoods: class, race, and family life*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
13. Katz J (2007) *Toward a Natural History of Ethical Censorship*. Law Society Review, Amherst , Massachusetts ,USA ,41(4): 797–810.
14. Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Becker AB (1998) Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 19: 173–202.
15. Loftus EF (2008) Perils of provocative scholarship. *APS Obs* 21(5).<https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/perils-of-provocative-scholarship>.
16. Smith LT (2012) *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd., New York.

### **in Arabic**

17. Bougattas, M. (2013). *The Problematic of Bias in Social Sciences: Towards an Islamic Perspective*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
18. Bani al-Marja, I. (2011). *Ethics of Scientific Research*. Al-Yazouri Scientific Publishing and Distribution.