Book Review/Compte rendu

van den Hoonaard, Will C. and Ann Hamilton (eds), *The Ethics Rupture: Exploring Alternatives to Formal Research Ethics Review*. University of Toronto Press. 2016, 464 pp. $67.50 cloth (9781442648326).

For anyone working in a university who has anything to do with research, formal ethics review is difficult to avoid. Yet as the contributors to *The Ethics Rupture* point out, there are worthy reasons to reflect on the pitfalls of formal ethics review and on ways to alter or circumvent the ethics process in the future. This collection is for scholars across the social sciences, not simply sociologists. The main point made in the groundbreaking collection is that research ethics review as it happens today in North America and beyond "trawls all research involving humans into the same net" (6). Ethics protocols limit qualitative research in many ways. As the editors Ann Hamilton and Will van den Hoonaard note in their introduction and conclusion, the myths that ethics review protocol are standardized and keep people safe must be challenged. The chapters in *The Ethics Rupture* reflect on the problems with current ethics review processes, but also on ways to subvert, resist, and avoid them.

The first section offers chapters that explore problems with the existing approach to research ethics in universities. In their respective chapters, Robert Dingwall and Rena Lederman assess problems with ethics protocol. Lederman convincingly argues that current approaches to ethics protocol efface difference and freedom in academic work, and that such ethics review is not appropriate for ethnographic, qualitative work (63). Patricia and Peter Adler review problems with institutional ethics review in the United States, contending that the ethics protection offered for researchers and participants is largely imagined (83). Next, Patrick O'Neill provides a similar assessment of ethics review in social psychological research, arguing that ethics protocols make it difficult to conduct longitudinal research. Laura Stark then reports on her empirical research with ethics review board chairs as well as scholars who have endured the ethics review process. Her argument is that ethics review board members are not well situated to review ethics applications involving multiple and minority languages (102). Marco Marzano critiques the idea of informed consent and the limits it introduces into qualitative research design.

Chapters in the second section explore how ethics reviewers often have trouble with new methodological techniques. Arguing that ethics boards are lagging behind innovations in research practice (141), Heather Dahringer reflects on how research ethics boards assess the privacy risks of internet research. Next, B. Lee Murray offers a similar analysis of how research ethics boards treat auto-ethnography. Julie Bull explores how research ethics boards address issues related to community consent as well as how Indigenous critiques of research ethics can provide alternatives to the existing system.

The third section offers chapters on recent changes in ethics protocol as well as data retention and sharing. Kirsten Bell examines recent changes in the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans and research ethics governance in Canada. Analyzing contradictions and anomalies in TCPS and other ethics guidelines in Canada (249), Igor Gontcharov similarly assesses changing conceptions of research respondents. Natasha Mauthner explores issues related to data sharing and regulation. Next, Lisa-Jo Kestin van den Scott examines the impact of research ethics boards on graduate students' experiences. Adding a comparative dimension, Iara Coelho Zito Guerriero assesses ethics protocols in Brazil.

Chapters in the fourth section (as well as the final assessment by the editors) reflect on how to subvert, resist and avoid the problems with ethics review as it is practiced today. Emma Tumilty, Martin Tolich and Stephanie Dobson point readers toward an online ethics application repository, which can help inexperienced researchers learn about the contents of ethics applications. Ron Iphofen discusses the need to balance academic and institutional goals. In a more critical direction, Mark Israel, Gary Allen, and Colin Thomson refer to research ethics governance in Australia as "counterproductive" (296) and argue ethics review protocols should be indexed to specific disciplines and areas of study. Hamilton and van den Hoonaard likewise suggest ethics review protocols are "stricter than necessary" (410), so should be altered. In a different chapter, Hamilton investigates reasons for compliance with and perpetuation of the existing system. As she notes, "a bias toward compliance permeates the system in part because of this notion of participant protection, and also because it is easier, safer, and substantially preferred, generally, to conform than to rebel" (346). Zachary Schrag makes an argument for ethical pluralism in ethics review, which would replace the current boilerplate approach evident at universities across Canada. Writing in the Australian context, Kate Holland argues scholars should be able to more directly shape ethics review protocol.

I view *The Ethics Rupture* not only as a sharp evaluation of the ethics review process in the early 21st century but as a commentary on research services and universities more broadly. Many of the authors have sat on ethics review boards before, so their criticisms are not speculative. The collection will appeal to anyone working in a university, not only academics but administrators and administrative staff as well. The only criticism I would raise is that alternatives to or resistance against ethics review are not explored enough in concrete detail. After reading *The Ethics Rupture* I do not come away with much clearer of an understanding of how I (alone or in conjunction with colleagues) can disrupt a problematic (but institutionalized) ethics review system. Nevertheless, *The Ethics Rupture* is original, indispensible, and has international appeal.

University of Winnipeg Kevin Walby

Kevin Walby is Associate Professor and Chancellor's Research Chair, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Winnipeg. He is co-author with R. Lippert of *Municipal Corporate Security in International Context* (2015, Routledge). He is co-editor of *Access to Information and Social Justice: Critical Research Strategies for Journalists, Scholars and Activists* with J. Brownlee (2015, ARP Books), *National Security, Surveillance, and Terror: Canada and Australia in Comparative Perspective* with R.K. Lippert, I. Warren and D. Palmer (2017, Palgrave), as well as *The Handbook of Prison Tourism* with J. Wilson, S. Hodgkinson, and J. Piche (2017, Palgrave). He is co-editor of the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* and book review editor for *Surveillance & Society*.

k.walby@uwinnipeg.ca