Ethics in Qualitative Research: Tanya Mackay on sharing ethical knowledge

Speaker information

- Sohail Jannesari (Interviewer) (Sohail)
- Tanya Mackay (Speaker) (Tanya)

[Start of recording]

[downtempo electronic music 00:00:00—00:00:10]

00:00:10 Sohail	Hi. I'm Sohail Jannesari. I'm from the Qualitative Applied Health Research Centre, mercifully shortened to QUAHRC. This is the *Qualitative Open Mic* and we are doing a series on ethical research in qualitative health. So, this series aims to highlight positive ethical practices in qualitative research, especially with marginalised groups. And in each episode we are going to think about what we can practically do to become more ethical researchers. So today we're very lucky. We've got with us Tanya MacKay. Do you want to introduce yourself?
00:00:42 Tanya	Okay. Thanks Sohail. So I'm Tanya. I work at the McPin Foundation. I'm a senior research manager. I work from a lived experience perspective myself. So I have lived experience of both being a service user and carer. Have been doing lived experience work across a range of sectors, primarily mental health, but also in spaces like the DV sector—domestic violence sector, financial literacy and old age people's research and from a peer perspective. So we're working with people who work from a peer perspective. So that's my background. And yeah, do a lot of peer research. So that's sort of where my passion lies.
00:01:11 Sohail	Grand. Thank you. And what do you mean by 'peer perspective'?
00:01:15 Tanya	So when I'm talking about peer research, I'm primarily talking about research done by people with similar lived or living experiences. In the work that we do at McPin, that's usually lived experiences or living experiences of mental ill health or mental health issues, similar to those in the research topic being studied.
00:01:30 Sohail	Okay. Thank you. So, just to have a bit of a broad question to start us off with, to what extent do you think qualitative health researchers speak honestly about the ethical challenges they face?
00:01:41 Tanya	Yeah. So I think with qualitative researchers, I think we're quite confident speaking about the ethical dilemmas we are most familiar with, or we get taught about the most. So things like informed consent and not—unblinding, so, not—you know, letting people know that they're not in the right arm of the study, or they're not in the control arm of the study. Or making sure that everything has the right information sheets and things. You know, don't cause any harm. And you know, there's basics of ethical research that we get taught when we are learning how to do research, often in our, you know, academic studies, whether that's a master's or PhD. Or in the field, if you're a researcher that's sort of being trained through practice rather than academia. But I think we find it harder to openly and honestly discuss ethical dilemmas that are more closely tied to our identities. I think in research, we often push to try and be as objective as possible. And objectivity, I don't know if it's fully possible in research. I think in lived experience or peer research, we're quite open that we use our subjectivity, our lived experiences in the work that we do. And we have methods for making sure that doesn't impact the research in any way. But I think in the broader research sector, there is a bit of hesitancy to really step into that space. And because we are hesitant to step into our subjectivity and our experiences and how they connect with the research, I think we're then hesitant to talk about the ethical dilemmas that are tied to those. So things like: what happens if someone really disagrees with me in an interview, and I feel really triggered, and I act a certain way, and maybe that impacts how the interview goes? Or what if I feel really strongly about this community because I'm part of the community, and I want to make sure their voices are heard, but I also don't want to make them feel coerced because they know me and I want to make sure they're doing this out of their own, you know, informed choice? All those things, I think we find it harder to talk about, because in a way they position us as less objective. Which I don't think is a negative thing. I actually think it's a positive thing to own that space. But yeah, I don't think we're as open and honest about those experiences as we could be.

00:03:29 Sohail	Thank you. Do you think it's just objectivity that makes people hesitant to step into their identities? I'm thinking, you know, a lot of qualitative researchers will appreciate and acknowledge that knowledge is, to a large extent, subjective. So is there something else about why perhaps we can be a bit hesitant?
00:03:49 Tanya	I mean, although most, I think, qualitative researchers I worked with would acknowledge that the data they're working with is subjective, I think they still try and distance themselves from it. So they—you know, they want to make sure that is the research, that is the data, "And I am here and that is there. And I haven't, you know, unduly influenced it any way. I haven't connected with it." And so I think—and I think that draws some positivist type models. You know, traditionally that kind of historical type of research where they're looking for facts, whereas in qualitative research we're looking for experiences. So I don't think we necessarily need to fear it so much. But I think it is also a concern about how people will perceive the research. Like will it be seen as validated or it will be seen as authentic or—do you know what I mean? If you stepped into the space too much. I mean obviously not everyone likes to use their own lived experience for a variety of reasons as well, and I think that's okay. But I think we all have lived experiences and most of us come into research, even if we're not lived experience researchers, because we're passionate about a topic. Even if we don't have lived experience of the topic. Which to me is an inherent interest or bias. Or, you know, there's something in it that means that you're drawn to it. I don't think we are so separate from any of the topics that we work with that anything can be fully outside of, you know, our perceptions of it. But yeah, I think that's probably one reason. I think—I mean, other reasons that we might be hesitant to talk about ethical dilemmas? Again, I think there's that power dynamic. I'm a researcher and participants are participants. And again, that probably leans on the objectivity still, doesn't it? Like that idea of researchers being this neutral, fact finding group of people who go out and do research, find knowledge, and then report it back. But it's much more complicated than that. And those power dynamics are much more complicated than that. And I think if we continue to lean into those dynamics, researcher and researched, we'll continue to sort of see epistemological injustices. People's voices not being heard. Their truths not being fully understood. You know, power is still taken away from communities to control the knowledge that's created about them. It should really be created with or by them. So I think it's quite important that we should step into those spaces a bit more.
00:05:47 Sohail	Okay. And that's really helpful. I was also thinking, like—from my perspective. So one of the reasons I might have been a bit hesitant is because—maybe it's linked to identity, but I don't want—and maybe it's linked to something you said about how my research is perceived. But sometimes the way the ethics happens doesn't quite match what I've put on paper. And I'm a bit hesitant to share that because then I think maybe my research will get criticised. Or maybe, like, I'll be seen as unethical because I didn't do exactly what I said I would do. And it happens sometimes because there's a clash between my identity as a researcher and my identity as part of the community I'm researching.
00:06:29 Tanya	Yeah. I mean I think that happens quite a bit. What you put down on paper maybe isn't exactly what happens in practice, and that can be for a range of reasons. Some of those are things like time constraints, practical constraints, for example. Sometimes it is because the community you're working with, they have preferences, and you're trying your best to respect those preferences, as well. And I think that can have an impact. I mean, just thinking about in terms of, like, experiences I've had with ethics committees and people who give ethical approval. I mean, I don't think I've ever had an instance where I've gone back to them and said, "I need to make this tweak," that they've ever said, "Oh no, that's a huge issue," or that, "You didn't do this particular thing," as an issue. They're usually pretty flexible around those things. So I wonder whether maybe there's a bit of a perception that maybe our research—you know, the plug will be pulled on our research if we don't do it exactly [chuckles] how we wrote it down on paper. Or, again, the validity might be questioned. But, again, validity is a subjective idea, I think particularly in qual research. But yeah, that would—you know, I think that concern about how people perceive the fact we didn't do exactly how we wrote

everything on paper is an important concern people will have. But I think part of the reason sometimes we do make those changes is because we are trying to work ethically. Because sometimes the thing we put down on paper is what we think as the researcher—even when we're working from a lived experience perspective, is what we think will be best. Right? So when we are doing that research process, the ethics process, and putting in that application, we think doing it this way will be the best way. And hopefully, you know, researchers had input from other people with lived experience, whether that's through an advisory group or co-applicants or peer researchers or however that might be. But sometimes there's not that input, for a variety of reasons and you do your best when you put that application in. But when you go out and start meeting the community you're working with, maybe the thing that you thought was the best thing is not the best thing. Like a really good example of that—you might say that a hundred percent you're going to get written consent. And then you go out and you realise that the community are distrusting of you and of research generally and maybe they don't want to sign things but are happy to give audio consent. And they fully understand the consent process and they understand the information sheet, but maybe they just prefer to give an audio consent. But you didn't that in the ethics application so you could go back and do all that again. And so I think, yeah, often when we do make those changes it's because we want to work ethically and in partnership with the communities that we're working with and people that we're working with, to make sure the research is good for them, as well as, you know, beneficial for us as researchers.

00:08:43 Sohail   I liked what you said about—I guess you implied that the people you were working with in research should perhaps be involved in and inform the ethics application process. Because that's something which it happens very early on in a project, and even to reach out to, let's say, your project partners or the people you want to work with, you have to complete it. What's the scope for genuinely involving people in that process?

00:09:09 Tanya   I mean, my experience in at McPin is that you can have people with lived experience who are not researchers. So they might not have as much research knowledge as, say, a peer researcher who's had some research training. So advisory panel members, for example. And some advisory panel members are very experienced. I think I'm just talking generally maybe newer advisory panel members. Even people who are brand new to being involved in research, I think, can be fully involved in the ethics process. I think sometimes the ethics process feels inaccessible because of the systems of it. So the paperwork can be very long. It can be lots of bouncing backwards and forwards between ethics panels at universities. And the language can be quite jargony which is inaccessible for a lot of people. But I think if you've got a good research support team or an organisation [chuckles] like McPin that does this day to day, you can really translate all that and make it accessible for people. I think it is easy to make it accessible for people, but you've got to have the commitment and resource to be able to make ethics accessible. Obviously from the other end, the system could make it more accessible themselves by making the form shorter [chuckles] and less jargony and all that kind of stuff. But if the system remains as is, there are basis for researchers to make it a process that people can be involved in who are not researchers. I think for me, one of the most important things is even before the ethics process, hopefully people have people with lived experience in the topic involved in the proposal in the first place, before you even get the funding. And that those people come with you along the journey, hopefully, to then do the ethics proposal, because they understand all the ethics of the application. Because they understand the proposal, they understand sort of what you're aiming to do. They've developed that with you. And they step into the ethics process with you. And there's trust between the research team and the lived experience members of that team already because you built it in developing the proposal stage, and everyone feels quite comfortable to openly discuss that ethics process and what that might look like. And I would say working with advisory panels has really helped me make better ethics applications. Because I better understand things like, "What might be tricky when I go out into this community? What might be the things that I need to consider in terms of making sure people are safe, and not stepping into spaces and making people uncomfortable? And what are the things I need to consider for peer researchers in terms of their wellbeing as well, because

they're stepping into spaces where [chuckles] they're using their lived experience?" And so in reality, I think bringing people in with lived experience into the ethics process makes it a better application. It will make a more thorough application. But in a way that's bottom-up and not top-down, which is the most important thing, I think.

00:11:26 Sohail	Thank you. Can you talk me a bit more through how—logistically and practically if you want to involve—and draw on the knowledge of the people you're working with—people with lived experience, let's say, if it's mental health. Even as you're constructing this application and in particular you want their input into the ethics of it, presumably you're going to have to get some more preliminary funding to pay people for their time and contribution. Can you—have you seen this done? Can you—do you have some examples you could share with us?
00:11:58 Tanya	I think that's probably the hardest bit, is finding funding for that. So sometimes that comes out of—you know, that is, I guess, taken out of organisations' budgets. It's not attached to a project in the hope that a project gets funded and then that money then, you know, pays back that time. That's one way that it's most commonly done, I would say. And it's not the best way of doing it. Because obviously, particularly organisations that are not within academic structures, charities, can find that quite difficult. Some researchers will already have access to a small grant funding that they can use for that. Particularly grant funding for developing research proposals. The NIHR have done some funding for developing proposals and partnerships, particularly funding development of partnerships between the charity sector and academia. So there is some funding out there but not a lot, and it's hard to get. I think it's probably one of the things that the system could invest more in, is funding for pre-work before a proposal goes in to make sure that the people who are engaged in it with lived experience who aren't on salary positions are still able to contribute to the process. But yeah, we—you know, we'd always say that people should be paid for their time. But it is probably the trickiest part, is if you haven't been funded, where does that money come from?
00:13:05 Sohail	And so I guess you were talking a bit about how charities and universities perhaps need to work together and share information about how to do research ethically. You talked a bit earlier about how maybe it would be nice to reform the application forms for ethics. Can you talk to me a bit more about what knowledge charities have to share with universities and if that's a two-way process or not? Around ethics obviously.
00:13:32 Tanya	I mean, I think charities are often quite connected to the communities they work with and have very good relationships with the communities they work with. Not always. We know that obviously the history of charity is a contentious one. But I think, you know, hopefully most charities [chuckles] have good relationships with the people they're working with and they're working in a way that is with people. And so they have that trust with people, to bring them into the process and support them in the process. They know people and they know their needs. Particularly people who've maybe done this work before and what adjustments might be needed for them to be involved in the process. People often know the people who are working in charities. They trust the individual as much as the charity itself, and that's quite important. The relationship building aspect is what charities can bring to it. And depending obviously on the focus of the charity as well. I mean McPin is a lived experience focused charity. So our team all have various aspects of their own lived experience in different ways, and they bring that knowledge as well. So they're not just bringing other people with lived experience, they're bringing themselves into the process which is an additional layer of knowledge. And different—other charities do that as well. So I think there's an additional richness that charities bring there. Universities, obviously, our work, we try and aim for it to be as reciprocal as possible. And you know, we encourage universities to work with us in a way that is in a partnership based model. So that, you know, we bring that knowledge and expertise and they bring knowledge and expertise of various things. And that particularly our peer researchers who maybe haven't worked in the academic system before can learn from our research partners about various aspects of research, and how ethics work, and how to use particular methodologies. For example, broader than just sort of a general thematic analysis that most people would be most familiar with in qualitative work. If you are using a particular analysis—narrative analysis, for example,

as a very particular method—that people might want to learn about, if we're working with researchers who are more quantitative based, you know, there's that reciprocal knowledge of learning about cost analysis and statistics and things that qual researchers might not be as familiar with as well. So we do aim for them to be reciprocal. I think one of the difficulties we have though as a charity in terms of ethics is that our access to ethics is usually reliant on an academic institution. So if we were to work in the community and wanted to do a research project of our own, without an academic partner, it would be near on impossible for us to get ethical approval without bringing an academic partner in who has a university affiliation, or a link to an institution, so that they can put the ethics application in through their institution. And that can make it difficult. Particularly when you're wanting to do ground-up research and you want to get ethical approval for it. And the reason you want to get ethical approval is one, so people—the people you're working with, you can tell them you have ethical approval and in some ways that helps build trust. Because they're like, "Oh, they've gone through a process." You know, "It's been signed off they can do this and that's good." Not everyone is on board with that. Sometimes communities will be, "Oh, it's just a rubber stamp." For some people it's very important. The other thing that's really important is if you want to publish. So if you want to do peer review publications—and for us, you know, as an organisation, we are really committed to putting lived experience knowledge out there and lived experience peer methods. And part of that process is peer review publication. There's often a requirement that you've had ethical approval to be able to publish. It's one of the things and an editor will just say, "No, you can't come through this journal because you haven't had an ethics committee approve it." Even if you've worked to the highest ethical standard. So you can meet all the same requirements an ethics committee will need you to meet, but if you haven't got that stamp, a journal might not take your paper. And that can be a real barrier to getting lived experience knowledge out into the world. And so in that sense, we do rely, I guess, on, you know, our academic partners to be able to access ethical processes. I think one big change that could really shift the balance of where knowledge is produced and who has access to produce knowledge would be making that—those processes accessible to other people who are not affiliated to an institution. Whether that means ethics committees stay embedded in institutions, and you just go to the institution but it is open to everybody, as long as long as you bring a valid research project, or whether there needs to be community-based ethics committees that can, you know, review this research, and say, "Yes, it's—you know, we can see the researchers know what they're doing and they're doing everything in a way that's not going to cause harm. They're not taking advantage of people and they're paying people appropriately," and all those things. You know, they're the two options. Which one is best? I think—I don't have a clear idea on that yet. And again, there's probably then the amalgamated model, where you bring the community and the universities together, and you have community members sitting on panels with university academics. I know that you have—most ethics boards now have lived experience members on the panels, but I don't think it's a high percentage of committees. I think if you could balance that percentage out a bit more, and then again, make it accessible to people outside of institutions, that might make it easier as well, to start shifting the balance of where knowledge is produced.

00:17:57 Sohail   So while you were talking I was thinking, I think in universities there's perhaps an underappreciation of the fact that there are researchers outside of a university context, and how important it is to perhaps build alliances and share knowledge between researchers in all contexts. And I was thinking of the group we're both part of, Inspiring Ethics, where I would say—we've had a couple of other people but you have a main person who is coming from a researcher from an NGO's perspective. And I think it's really, really critical. So, yeah, what do you think of those alliances? How do we build a more—is it so clear cut that someone is a university researcher and someone's an NGO researcher? Am I making this up a bit? [chuckles]

00:18:42 Tanya   I think sometimes it can feel that clear cut. Like, as in, it can feel like there's a separation. So before I worked in NGO research, I worked in university-based research. And I didn't start my career as a lived experience researcher, at least not open about my lived experience. I would say I was just an academic—because I started as a

research assistant, not using my lived experience openly or actively. And then I very clearly moved into the charity NGO sector. And it does feel quite different. And that's for a variety of reasons. The structures are very different. I am in a very small charity so the structures in and of itself as an employer are very different, as an 00:19:13 organisation are very different. There's a lot more flexibility, I think. As a researcher, I feel like I get a lot of support in the charity sector. And so it does feel sometimes very different, I think, as an individual who's been in both. I don't know if that's the case for everyone. It probably isn't. And I work now with academics and people who are in the academic system a lot. And a lot of my projects I'm partnering with people who are based in the academic sector. And often I have an honorary contract as part of those [chuckles] projects, as part of the institution. But I still don't feel a part of the institution, I suppose. Like I'm not in their system. So sometimes it does feel as clear as that because we don't have—I mean another example—[sighs] a really silly example but a really obvious one is academic researchers have access to institutional libraries and databases. You know, they can access all that knowledge for free. As an NGO researcher, if we don't have a subscription to anything, or we don't have an honorary contract, we don't have access to all those databases. We can only access, you know, the Open Access, peer-reviewed grey literature that's out there on the web. So in some ways it does feel very separate, even if we do the exact same work. And I think that's probably one of the things that people sometimes miss, is that you can be a charity researcher doing high quality, robust research that is just as important and adds just as much knowledge to what we know about a topic or an issue, but sometimes it's seen as not as—I don't know, not as academic. Not as robust as research done within the university context. Even if you use the exact same methods and all the exact same approaches and doing everything the same, it's not done within an institution so it's not seen as—yeah, as academic or as robust. So, yeah, I'd say sometimes it does feel that clear-cut. That there are people who are outside in the charity sector and people that are academics. But people do move between those roles. I don't think once you're in one you're kind of limited to one. People move in and out of them all the time. I mean there are people that—obviously that work both in charities and in academia, say in split jobs for example; so spends part of their time working in charity and part of their time working as an academic. And maybe, again, it probably doesn't feel as clear-cut for them because they're doing both roles and it probably blends across. And then you'll have, for example, people who do fellowships that might be based in a charity. Doing a fellowship in an institution probably doesn't feel as clear-cut for them. But I guess in terms of the ethics process, it definitely feels like that's a space that you need to be in the system to access. Yeah.

00:21:34 Sohail	In terms of being an ethical researcher, do you think that it's useful to have had experience of both spaces?
00:21:43 Tanya	I think it was—actually for me, although I started my career in academia, most of my—I would say my development as an ethical researcher came from mentoring. So working with another researcher who had, again, worked across both sectors as well, who was my mentor and taught me about ethical research and practice. Because I think you can read about ethical research and what we need to do as ethical researchers, but what that looks like in the field can be quite different. And again, it's quite different depending on which community you're working with and what ethical research means to that community. So I think I probably learnt more through that process than I did through, you know, being taught about research in a structured academic way. You know, through the, you know, learning process. I mean I would say that learning to be an ethical researcher has continued out in the charity sector in a different way. And not necessarily learning from other researchers, but learning from the communities and working with what ethical research means to them, and what that looks like in practice. Because again, I think consent is a really good one. Where—as researchers often we are like, "Yeah. Okay, we've got a six-page information sheet [chuckles] and a three-page consent form, and it has all this stuff that we have to put in it. And we're going to send that out to people with a link or an email to invite them, or go speak to them in the community and then I'll give them this information sheet and consent form." But when you speak to people, that is the least engaging or accessible way [chuckles] to get their interest in the research and get them to understand the consent process and

what they're engaging in. You know, when you speak to people, things like video information sheets, or audio information sheets, or shortened versions of those, or infographics to go with that written one, all those things can make the process more accessible for them and ensure that they're giving informed consent in the most informed way. Which is one of the most important things about ethics, is that people are consenting to things and they know what they're consenting to. But I don't think we're really taught about those things when you're being taught how to be an ethical researcher. You're not given the options of, "These are the different ways you could approach these things to still work ethically, but to engage with people at a level where they're at and what works best for them." And so that—you know, those different tools of how to do ethical research have come from the communities I've worked with over time, and understanding how to put those into practice has come from there. So I think in that sense, yeah, I think having done both has given me a particular knowledge and both have given me different types of knowledge. But I've learned more from the—I'd say the informal learning than the formal learning process, I would say.

| 00:23:59 Sohail | Okay, that's really interesting. So maybe there's something which could be different about formal learning process. There's something around the way that ethical knowledge is shared between lecturers and students which isn't quite working. Do you have a way forward? I was thinking maybe it's something around the theory is being shared but not the actual practical skills. |

| 00:24:20 Tanya | Yeah. I mean I remember doing ethics in my research courses at university I never actually filled in an ethics application form. [chuckles] I was taught about all the basics of what ethical research is, drawing on philosophy and morality and all those things, and you know, theoretical knowledge behind it, but I never filled in an ethics application form. I never practically had to think, "Okay, I'm doing—you know, I have a case study research project and I'm going to think about how I'd ethically do this research project." I didn't do any of that at the university. Maybe that's changed. It was a while ago since I was at the university [chuckles] so they might be doing that now. But it definitely wasn't something I got when I did research studies at university. And comparatively we did get that for things like how to do thematic analysis, or how to do notes in the field, or how to do ethnography. Or—you know, we actually got case studies and we had to develop proposals for that. But we never went to the stage of developing the ethical proposal to go along with that. So that could change. I also think that, you know, the formal learning system is obviously quite heavily reliant on lecturing, assignments, completing essays, exams, and I think there is space there for more mentoring. I think particularly early career researchers come out into the world of work of research, and often don't have very strong networks for mentoring or engaging with other researchers, and learning from other researchers what it's like to be in practice. And how much of that they get is really relying on the jobs they get and the people they connect with. So I think there's probably space there to better explore how we support early career researchers with mentoring and networks. And especially lived experienced researchers, who are maybe coming into the research field from alternative pathways. So they might not be coming through the traditional university pathway. How do we connect them to mentors who are—have experience in academia and can mentor them, if they do want to go into that system or explore roles in that space? And again, that's, I think, quite hard to come by; good mentors that do that kind of work. So I think it is a space, you know, that could really improve people's knowledge of doing ethical research. |

| 00:26:09 Sohail | Thank you for that. I think it makes a lot of sense to look at how you improve your ethical skills through mentoring and networks. It's about—ethics is kind of about relationships, and the way you are suggesting to develop your ethical skills is through relationships. That makes a lot of sense to me. And that leads me on to my penultimate question. In that context where we were really thinking about, "Okay, ethics is, you know, strong, trusting, meaningful relationships. That's when you get good qualitative health research." What's the role for written guidance, for instance? Is that useful at all? Or is that something which is outdated? |

00:26:48 Tanya	I think written guidance is useful—and I'm thinking through this just from an accessibility perspective as much as anything, right? So some people will learn best through verbal conversation and mentoring. Some people will learn best through reading things, and having a checklist they can go to, and making sure it's there and they can follow that. Some people prefer things like podcasts or audio files to be able to listen to how to do things, and other people like to watch videos. I think if we are really thinking about how we give guidance to researchers, particularly new researchers on how to work ethically, making sure we have as many options as possible is the best way forward. I think written guidance plays a part in that. Myself, I like to read things, so I like written guidance. I like to have written guidance and also that connects me to people and have conversations about the written guidance. So I read something and then I like to explore that and critique it and understand it with other people. And so ensuring those spaces are available to have those conversations are quite important so people can, you know, understand them. I think just giving someone written guidance and saying, "This is how you do ethical research, off you go," is not going to be the best way of going about it. You need that additional layer, I think. But in saying that, there is never any harm having different formats for people who need them. But again, if you're going to go written, I would say make sure it's not jargony. You know, it's lay and explains things simply and doesn't overcomplicate things and is relatable for people. If it doesn't feel like it's relatable to your research—so I think a really good example is a lot of ethics processes feel like they're aimed at quantitative or very medical biomedical type research. And when you come as a qual researcher and you read the formula, "I don't know if this quite applies to the work that I'm doing." So making sure it's relatable for qual researchers as well, and reflects the kind of work that we do, as much as it reflects the other types of work that other people do. Because both are valid types of research. But we just need to make sure there are, you know, written guidance for both that reflects the needs of both.
00:28:33 Sohail	Great. Thank you so much. That was an excellent answer. So to end, I just wanted to ask, you know, where do we find out more about your work, or are there any ethical resources which we should be looking at, or you know, useful websites to read more about what you've mentioned?
00:28:50 Tanya	So I guess obviously to find out about our work, we have them in McPin website, so www.mcpin.org, I think it is. We have all our information there. We've got a brand new website, which is really cool that our team have worked really hard on. And all our work is on there and the types of work that we do. The team at McPin is always happy to talk to people, so you can always just reach out to us directly as well, and we're always happy to have a chat to people. In terms of ethical resources, I would say one of the difficulties is there's not much out there. If you sort of wanted to know how to do ethical research, particularly if you're not in an institution—I'm sure institutions have lots of guides embedded in their systems that you can look for. But if you're outside of an institution, finding sort of guides on how to do ethical research are not that common. And I think it's one area that, you know, there could be investment in to make more accessible resources for people to better understand the ethics process. Obviously as you mentioned here, we're in the Inspiring Ethics group. And I think that's one thing that we're focused on, is developing those resources and connecting with community to make understanding ethics an accessible process to sort of variety of things like community workshops and events and all that kind of stuff. So I think that's really important to expand those resources. And yeah, I guess McPin is celebrating its ten-year anniversary this year. And we're about to release, later in the year, ten resources about the work that we do, which will cover a range of things from peer research to patient and public involvement, to our learnings around anti-oppressive work, and just lived experience in the workplace in general. And so they'll be available online for people that are interested in those as well.
00:30:09 Sohail	Great. Thank you. Very exciting. Congratulations to McPin. I hope there's cake involved.
00:30:15 Tanya	I think an event is planned, so there may be cake involved.

00:30:19 Sohail   Excellent. If that's not an incentive, I don't know what is. Well, thank you very much Tanya. I really, really appreciate your time, I really appreciate your thoughts and that was an excellent episode. And next episode [downtempo electronic music fades in] we're going to explore ethics in even more details, so please join us then and goodbye. [music fades out]

[End of recording]