Revista Brasileira de Educação do Campo
Brazilian Journal of Rural Education
ARTIGO/ARTICLE/ARTÍCULO

Reflections on ethics in scientific research: specificities of the field of education

Camila Mugnai Vieira[1], Ana Carolina Nonato[2], Bianca Pereira Rodrigues Yonemotu[3]
[1] Universidade Estadual Paulista - UNESP. Departamento Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano. Avenida Hygino Muzzi Filho, 737. Marília – SP. Brasil. [2] Faculdade de Medicina de Marília – Famema. [3] Faculdade João Paulo II - FAJOPA.

Author for correspondence: camila.mugnai@unesp.br

ABSTRACT. Ethics in research involves a commitment to the responsible and collective construction of scientific knowledge. This bibliographical review of exploratory character seeks to examine a few dilemmas and challenges related to research in Education, which include prominent aspects such as researcher responsibility, anonymity, secrecy and risk minimization, but also discussing the specificities of the human sciences and the difficulty of evaluating biomedical orientation of several Ethics Committees, even with the existence of resolution CNS 510/2016. Furthermore, it is proposed, how to deal ethically in the relationship between the researcher and participants and the importance of returning results~~,~~ maintaining the commitment to the observed reality. Finally, it is argued that the researcher's training throughout his career must include attitudinal and interactional aspects of ethics, as the construction of ethically responsible research is directly dependent on values committed to scientific integrity.

Keywords: research, education, ethics.

Reflexões sobre a ética na investigação científica: especificidades da área da educação

RESUMO. A ética na pesquisa envolve o compromisso com a construção responsável e coletiva do conhecimento científico. Este ensaio teórico busca examinar os dilemas e desafios relacionados à pesquisa em Educação, que incluem aspectos proeminentes, como responsabilidade do pesquisador, anonimato, sigilo e minimização de riscos, mas discutindo também as especificidades das ciências humanas e a dificuldade de avaliação pela orientação biomédica de diversos Comitês de Ética, mesmo com a existência da resolução CNS 510/2016. Ademais, propõe-se analisar infrações éticas, como lidar eticamente com resultados que refutam a hipótese inicial e a importância da devolutiva dos resultados aos participantes e às instituições, mantendo o compromisso com a realidade observada. Por fim, defende-se que a formação do pesquisador durante toda sua trajetória deva incluir os aspectos atitudinais e interacionais sobre ética, pois a construção de uma pesquisa eticamente responsável é diretamente dependente de valores comprometidos com a integridade científica.

Palavras-chave: pesquisa, educação, ética

Reflexiones sobre la ética en la investigación científica: especificidades del campo de la educación

RESUMEN. La ética en la investigación implica un compromiso con la construcción responsable y colectiva del conocimiento científico. Este ensayo teórico busca examinar los dilemas y desafíos relacionados con la investigación en Educación, que incluyen aspectos destacados como la responsabilidad del investigador, el anonimato, el secreto y la minimización de riesgos, pero también discutir las especificidades de las ciencias humanas y la dificultad de evaluar la orientación biomédica de varios Comités de Ética, aún existiendo la resolución CNS 510/2016. Además, se propone analizar las infracciones éticas, cómo afrontar éticamente los resultados que refutan la hipótesis inicial y la importancia de devolver los resultados a los participantes e instituciones, manteniendo el compromiso con la realidad observada. Finalmente, se sostiene que la formación del investigador a lo largo de su carrera debe incluir aspectos actitudinales e interaccionales de la ética, pues la construcción de una investigación éticamente responsable depende directamente de valores comprometidos con la integridad científica.

Palabras clave: investigación, educación, ética.

Introduction

Ethics in scientific research is a fundamental pillar not only for the advancement of human knowledge but also for the integrity and social responsibility inherent in the investigative process. As the boundaries of science expand, complex ethical issues emerge, demanding a careful and reflective perspective on the practices and principles that guide researchers (Barrow, Brannan & Khandhar, 2024).

In the contemporary context, the importance of academic and scientific credibility becomes increasingly prominent in the face of challenges imposed by political influences, economic interests, and misinformation campaigns, such as unfounded doubts about vaccines. These elements compromise the public's relationship with scientific knowledge and highlight the need for rigorous research ethics. Such ethics must address issues including fraud, data falsification, misuse of works, plagiarism, inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants, methods of data collection and analysis, research process management, and the relationships between researchers and participants. Furthermore, it includes the necessity of broad dissemination and democratization of access to scientific results, underscoring that ethical considerations and researchers' social engagement are crucial for the continuous improvement of scientific research (Padilha et al., 2005).

The practice and intentionality of scientific research constitute critical areas of analysis for the refinement of methodology and academic ethics. Through experiences, guidance, or group discussions, the importance of avoiding generalizations and adopting an impartial approach—avoiding references to specific individuals or institutions—is emphasized. In this context, addressing conflicts of interest is also essential, as these may arise from various interactions, such as between researchers and pharmaceutical industries, private institutions, employers and supervisors, or within educational environments, such as the relationship between teachers and students or management and staff. Clarity and open debate are needed to preserve research integrity (Padilha et al., 2005).

Given these issues, researchers face the challenge of navigating existing regulations while maintaining ethical conduct aligned with their fields of study. This requires balancing methodological rigor with respect for fundamental ethical principles, particularly regarding research involving human participants.

Specifically, in educational research, there are unique challenges and dilemmas. Exploring these issues raises questions about the adequacy of ethics committees, which often follow biomedical guidelines, when confronted with the realities of the humanities, as indicated by Resolution CNS 510/2016 (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2016).

This exploratory bibliographical review aims to analyze the historical, conceptual, and practical landscape of research ethics aligned with the specificity and reality of research in the humanities, particularly in the area of Education.

Ethics in research

The complexity of ethics and integrity in scientific research becomes evident when considering the historical context of human experimentation. At various times, research practices have caused significant suffering to many individuals and groups due to drug studies, invasive medical procedures, and psychological experiments conducted under extreme conditions such as in total institutions and during wartime conflicts (Barrow, Brannan & Khandhar, 2024).

A number of examples of unethical studies conducted in the past, across different parts of the world, have cast a significant historical shadow on research involving human subjects. Among these examples are the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, which occurred from 1932 to 1972, Nazi medical experimentation during the 1930s and 1940s, and research conducted at the Willowbrook State School in the 1950s and 1960s. As a consequence of these practices, in which uninformed and unconsenting patients were exposed to diseases or subjected to unproven treatments, the need for regulations governing the planning and implementation of research protocols involving human subjects became clearly evident (Barrow, Brannan, & Khandhar, 2024).

The first ethical code for research to emerge was the Nuremberg Code, created following the disclosure of atrocities in Nazi research during the Nuremberg Trials after World War II. This set of international research standards sought to prevent grotesquely inappropriate conduct and the abuse of vulnerable and naïve research subjects by establishing specific protections for human participants. A direct descendant of this code was drafted in 1978 in the United States, known as the Belmont Report (Barrow, Brannan & Khandhar, 2024).

Bioethics emerged as a field of study focused on analyzing ethical issues inherently tied to life, with particular emphasis on the human experience. This field took on defined contours with the contribution of Tom Beauchamp and James Childress in 1979, who introduced the four fundamental principles of bioethics: beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice. These principles form the foundation for ensuring respect for the physical, psychological, and moral integrity of not only research participants but also animals, fostering fair and cruelty-free treatment (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Given this historical context, the crucial importance of professional ethics in the scientific field emerges, grounded on the premise that every profession has a code of ethics monitored by specific councils. In research, scientific ethics stands out as an essential pillar due to its commitment to the collective construction of knowledge as a common good. This ethical orientation asserts that scientists must responsibly promote scientific progress, avoiding any actions that could hinder collective collaboration or the democratization of scientific benefits. When this orientation is disregarded, it not only compromises trust in research results harming collaboration among researchers but also undermines public confidence in science, weakening its primary objective of expanding human knowledge and sensibly guiding actions in various fields.

Furthermore, scientific research is structured on three ethical levels: regulatory, institutional, and personal, encompassing all stages from research design to the dissemination of results, as highlighted by Fernandes (2016). At all these levels, researchers must not only adhere to established ethical codes but also face everyday dilemmas to ensure respect for fundamental ethical principles. This challenge becomes particularly relevant in research involving children or other legally protected groups, such as individuals with disabilities or severe mental disorders. It is necessary to safeguard the rights and well-being of participants while navigating ethical dilemmas, such as consent through representation versus the autonomy of children or other participants. Additionally, appropriate population selection is crucial to avoid the risk of harm or exclusion, aspects carefully analyzed by Francischini and Fernandes (Francischini & Fernandes, 2016).

Thus, reflecting on the role of ethics in research highlights its fundamental importance not only as protection against past mistakes but also as a guide for responsible and respectful scientific practice in the present and future.

Ethics in research in Brazil

The trajectory towards ensuring ethical practices in scientific research has developed significantly, reflected in regulations and the establishment of ethics committees dedicated to the analysis and approval of research projects. In Brazil, the resolutions of the National Health Council (CNS), particularly resolutions No. 196/96 and 466/2012, have established a fundamental regulatory framework. These resolutions require that any research involving human beings be submitted to and approved by an ethics committee, ensuring that studies align with recognized ethical principles (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 1996, 2012).

In 1996, the National System for Ethical Review of Research Involving Human Beings, better known as the CEP/Conep System, was created, with CEP referring to Research Ethics Committees and Conep to the National Research Ethics Commission. To computerize the system, the National System of Information on Research Ethics (Sisnep/CNS) was established the same year, facilitating the registration of research involving human beings, integrating the systems of Research Ethics Committees (CEP), and allowing the monitoring of approved projects. However, it had limitations, such as allowing only the completion of the cover sheet, making results visible only at the end of the project evaluation process, and not all CEPs had access. In 2012, Sisnep was replaced by Plataforma Brasil, which expanded the capacity for project authors to complete all required data and documentation, enabling monitoring of all evaluation phases of the CEP and responses to pending issues. Additionally, it facilitated communication between CEP and Conep, as they could forward projects to reviewers, insert agendas and meeting minutes, among other functions (Barbosa; Corrales; Silbermann, 2014).

The CEP/Conep System plays a crucial role in ensuring the ethics of research involving human beings in Brazil, safeguarding the protection and respect for the rights, integrity, and dignity of participants. Structured into two main entities, the system includes CEPs and the National Research Ethics Commission (Conep). CEPs operate as interdisciplinary and independent bodies with consultative, deliberative, and educational responsibilities, essential for protecting the interests of research participants. They can be established at various administrative levels, according to specific guidelines established by CNS Resolution No. 370/07 and Conep Operational Standard No. 001/13, not being limited to educational and research institutions. The entry of research projects into the system begins with the CEP, which evaluates the ethical complexity of the research (Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa, 2020).

On the other hand, Conep is responsible for the creation of CEPs, the formulation of specific ethical guidelines, and the evaluation of research projects in special thematic areas (Barbosa; Corrales; Silbermann, 2014), such as genetics and human reproduction, unregistered health products, pharmaceuticals, among others (Batista; Andrade; Bezerra, 2012). Instituted by CNS Resolution No. 196/96 (later repealed by CNS Resolution No. 466/2012), Conep operates in a broader scope, with consultative, deliberative, normative, and educational prerogatives. Linked to the CNS and the Ministry of Health, this commission has the authority to establish regulations, deliberate, and promote education on ethical aspects of research with human beings, guiding researchers, ethics committees, research institutions, research sponsors, and participants. Therefore, the CEP/Conep System is fundamental for the ethical conduct of research across various fields of knowledge, ensuring necessary protection for participants and promoting scientific development grounded in ethical principles in Brazil (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 1996, 2012).

However, despite progress in establishing a solid ethical foundation for research involving human beings, the need to consider the peculiarities of fields such as the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education has been recognized. Traditionally guided by principles from the Biomedical field, focused primarily on the physical and psychological protection of participants, ethical guidelines have often proven insufficient to encompass the diversity and specificity of methodologies used in these fields, which include qualitative, participatory, or ethnographic approaches (Guerriero, 2016).

In response to these limitations, CNS Resolution 510/2016 emerged as an innovative regulatory framework, distinguishing itself by focusing on the particularities of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Education, and related fields. This resolution established criteria better suited to the needs of these disciplines, including, among other aspects, the formation of specialized ethics committees, the exemption of ethical review for certain types of studies, such as documentary analyses and bibliographical research, and the flexibility in handling information and the consent process for participants (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2016; Guerriero, 2016).

In addition to proposing more suitable guidelines for the reality of these research areas, CNS Resolution 510/2016 aims to promote a broader and more integrated understanding of ethics in research. In doing so, it not only emphasizes the protection of individual participants but also considers justice and equity in the process of knowledge generation. By encouraging a more inclusive and comprehensive ethical vision, this resolution aims to not only raise scientific quality but also ensure the ethical integrity of research, thereby enhancing its contributions to the advancement of knowledge and promoting meaningful social change (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2016; Guerriero, 2016).

Aspects of ethics in research

In the current context, marked by a growing concern with the standards and ethics in research involving human subjects, the protection of participants emerges as a fundamental issue. This evolution reflects the recognition of the importance of harmonizing social well-being with the safety and rights of individuals involved in research. Practices such as informed consent, confidentiality, careful evaluation of risks and benefits, and the right of participants to withdraw from the study without any harm are now considered crucial elements of any ethically responsible study (Binsfeld, 2019).

To comply with ethical principles, research must (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2012, 2016):

- Ensure the protection of participants' dignity and autonomy, recognizing their potential vulnerability. This includes ensuring that participants have the freedom to make informed decisions about their inclusion, participation, or withdrawal from the study through clear, voluntary, and well-informed consent;
- Carefully balance risks and benefits, whether known or potential, and whether of an individual or collective nature. The aim should be to maximize benefits while minimizing harm and associated risks;
- Prevent any anticipated harm by ensuring protective measures are in place to avoid such occurrences; and
- Possess significant social relevance, ensuring that the interests of all involved are considered equitably. This means maintaining a focus on the humanitarian contribution and positive social impact of the research.

The leading investigator is required to ensure effective and clear communication of research-related information to all participants, ensuring that this information is provided both orally and documented in the Informed Consent Form (ICF). This document details the obligation to offer complete and immediate assistance at no cost, for an indefinite period, in the event of any harm caused by the research. Additionally, it is necessary to guarantee reimbursement for any expenses incurred from participating in the study, including those made by accompanying individuals (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2012, 2016).

Specifically, in the context of research involving minors or legally protected individuals, it is essential to ensure that both the legal guardian and the participant are informed about the full assistance provided, following the same principles of immediacy, gratuity, and duration. The same applies to research involving pregnant women, ensuring that both the mother and the child receive comprehensive care during and after pregnancy (Miranda et al., 2017).

The ICF is a crucial document that must clearly articulate the potential benefits of the research, without exaggerating them. If no direct benefits are expected, this information must be explicitly stated. All potential risks associated with the research must be carefully documented in the ICF, without downplaying them. Furthermore, the ICF should detail the precautionary measures and procedures implemented to mitigate or prevent these risks, aiming to fully protect research participants.

The autonomy of participants is of utmost importance, ensuring that they have the freedom to decide about their participation in the research without pressure, with the possibility to withdraw consent at any time, including regarding the use and storage of biological materials. Participants also have the right to full and immediate assistance, free of charge, in case of harm resulting from the research. It is expressly prohibited for the researcher to withhold information about the available assistance or limit the extent or duration of such assistance. Moreover, the Resolution emphasizes the right of participants to compensation for damages and reimbursement of expenses related to participation in the research. The ICF should clearly and affirmatively outline these rights, ensuring that such compensation is not tied to the existence of insurance (Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2012; Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa, 2020).

Expanding the analysis to the democratization of science, the Covid-19 pandemic highlighted the gap between academics and the general population, who are often more susceptible to distorted information. This created the need to make scientific knowledge more accessible and relevant to the public by employing innovative communication methods, including social media and formats such as animations and games, which can present complex topics in a more comprehensible and engaging way. This approach not only promotes social inclusion but also reflects the fundamental ethical principles of Justice, Autonomy, Beneficence, and Non-Maleficence, illustrating the social role of the researcher (PAHO; WHO, 2022).

In summary, addressing ethical issues in research requires continuous reflection and a flexible approach, balancing normative and institutional requirements with the ethical commitment inherent in the research activity.

Challenges to ethics in educational research

Ethics in scientific research encompasses a wide range of concerns and challenges that require constant attention from the academic community, including individual researchers and, particularly, Research Ethics Committees (RECs). These entities play a crucial role in monitoring and analyzing research projects, ensuring they align with current ethical standards. However, RECs face multiple limitations, including a lack of human resources and challenges in complying with diverse norms and regulations, which significantly complicates their functioning (Alves & Teixeira, 2020; Batista, Andrade & Bezerra, 2012).

An additional problem arises from the lack of diversity within the RECs themselves, limiting the variety of perspectives in the ethical evaluation processes. This is not the only challenge: criticisms are also directed toward the preparation and the complex format of Informed Consent Forms (ICF), which may be intimidating or confusing for research participants. Such complexity can undermine the principle of informed consent, which is crucial for respecting the autonomy of the participants (Alves & Teixeira, 2020).

Moreover, there are concerns about the restrictive use of the concept of risk, often limited to invasive procedures, because ethical standards have their origin in the health area, and the demand for greater flexibility in regulations that allow for methodological adaptations suited to the diversity of research. The lack of transparency and empathy in processes highlights the need for a more humane and less bureaucratic ethical management of research (Alves & Teixeira, 2020; Moro, Coutinho & Pinho, 2023).

Resolution CNS 510/2016 represented an important advancement by introducing guidelines that recognize the specificities of research in the human and social sciences. This resolution allowed variations in the ICF format, addressing the particular needs of the studied populations and enabling more ethical and less invasive approaches. However, difficulties in the effective implementation of this resolution, including its dissemination and practical adoption by RECs, signal the need for greater dissemination of these specific guidelines (Alves & Teixeira, 2020; Mainardes, 2017).

One of the dilemmas in research with minors and/or groups that depend on legal tutors, like some of the Special Education public, such as individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder that have high levels of support, people with multiple and/or severe deficiencies, with serious psychiatric disorders, refers to consent, once that the Informed Consent Forms

(ICF) must be signed by legal tutors. This imposition attends the legal and bureaucratic demand, however there are other dimensions, like the autonomy of the child and individuals in the process, and the relationships of power among adults and children, tutors and tutored (Francischini & Fernandes, 2016).

The conception of the child as an individual that has rights must embrace the respect of its conscious decisions about participating or not of the proposed procedures. Sigaud et al. (2009) argues, therefore, that language strategies must be adopted to allow participants of different ages, in many stages of development and contexts, to comprehend and talk about their involvement inside of the research.

The so called Informed Consent Forms (ICF) comes to attend to this need. The proposal is that beyond the signature of the ICF by the legal responsible, children and people that demand a legal tutor, may be heard about their wishes of getting involved in the research. But, when speaking of consent, it is necessary to consider the complexity of choices, possible embarrassments and mutual expectations (Fernandes, 2016). There are relationships of power between children and adults and researcher and researched. Even if there isn't an explicit coercion, aspects that are more subtle must be considered to the obtention of consent and/or agreement of the public, like for example, the condition of understanding the research, the need to please or the fear of frustrating the other. It occurs a process that has a lot of dialog, trust establishment, maximum respect to the integrity of the child and a lot of patience from the researcher (Gaiva, 2009), which not always happens in face of the short terms, the lack of time to collect information, terms that are long, written in an academic language that is very little comprehensible and accessible to a good part of population, and others.

Another relevant challenge in the research with children refers to the selection of the participants. The criteria of inclusion or exclusion of determined groups, sometimes justified by some designs, must be reflected and worked properly because it may expose some children to the privation of benefits of a few interventions (Fernandes, 2016), for example, by being part of the Control Group only, or even, to situations that might evoke feelings of exclusion, like not being able to participate in activities that all of the colleagues are going to be part of, because of their legal guardian did not sign, forgot or even lost the ICF. It must be questioned: what are the biggest losses in these occasions?

Certain overprotection of children might take them away from important research, that could bring benefits straight to them like participants and would have the potential of advancing in the production of knowledge about this social group. Leaving children only to what is institutionalized might lead them to what Fernandes (2016) named “epistemological invisibility”, leaving the participation of children marginalized only to what is institutionalized.

Developments and proposals

Considering the dilemma pointed out about the possible exclusion of students from some researches in order of the lack of feedback of the ICF’s signed by the responsibles, Vieira and Omote (2017) adopted an interesting alternative when they proposed an informative program to be developed inside of the classroom by the Professors. It was considered that the students who were unable to be part of the project could feel excluded in the activities that could be enjoyed by them, creating delicate situations. In this context, the researchers understood that the exclusion of any student from the intervention would bring more risks or damage to it than participating without having the ICF signed. Anticipating this possibility, when submitting to REC (and the feedback was positive) the ICF to the responsibles, it was required only the permission to use the data of the child in the studies, but not in their participation in meetings of the informative program developed by the Professors inside of the classroom and previously approved by the school’s principal and coordination office. Thus, the informative program was applied in classrooms to all of the students. Those who did not have the ICF signed by their tutors participated in the meetings for the execution of activities but not for the collected data.

Still considering the expansion of the understating of children and other groups that depend on third party consent, it is the accessibility of the ICF. The idea of only one format written in a very little understandable language, extremely long, has to change to possibilities that embrace different populations and mixed conditions, including, for example, audiovisual strategies, recordings, drawings, alternative and augmentative communication. Some of these possibilities are lightly suggested in the Resolution CNS 510/2016, allowing its use. However, as said before, it is a very little known document and rarely debated, even in the academic field (Alves & Teixeira, 2020; Mainardes, 2017), coming from REC the demand on using only traditional types of terms.

The use of control groups in experimental and almost-experimental researches with human beings may expand the trust in some designs with interventions, but there is a certain ethical dilemma, once people who are part of these groups usually don't have access to the interventions that were proposed, even if it is clear that they are likely beneficial (Dutra & Reis, 2016).

Vieira and Omote (2017) indicated the alternative of copying the intervention, performed initially with the experimental group, in a distinct moment, with the control group, attending this ethical demand of offering to all participants the access to possible benefits from the intervention. In face of the short terms of research in most of the cases, it is suggested that this procedure is done after the end of data collection, without compromising institutional schedules.

By the end of every research, the feedback to participants of the results obtained should be an mandatory stage, however, it is frequently the complaint of institutions, like schools, for example, that researchers spend some time in a place to collect data and in the end they don't come back to show the results that were obtained, in a way that both institution and participants could benefit from the knowledge brought from their own participation. Usually, when occurs, academic reports are sent but they are very little functional for these means. Almeida et al. (2018) advocate that the feedback should not only be part of the academic formality, but an opportunity to evaluate the process, to reinforce the social commitment of researchers to the context, participants and/or institution.

It is essential to recognize that, in order to promote an ethics of research that is truly responsible and inclusive, it is necessary to go beyond the usual operational and technical challenges. This commitment involves addressing significant ethical dilemmas, such as issues of authorship and plagiarism, ensuring fairness and respect for all intellectual contributions. In this pursuit, the continuous critical evaluation of REC practices emerges as imperative, as well as the need to foster interaction between various fields of knowledge. By means of these actions, the goal is to develop an ethical approach that resonates with the complexity and interdisciplinarity of modern research.

To achieve such an advancement in research ethics, it is crucial to expand our understanding and approach beyond merely obtaining signed consent forms. This implies carefully considering methodological requirements, study subjects, and engaging in effective monitoring of the research process from start to finish. In this context, it is clear that the role of RECs must be broadened to encompass not only the initial approval of projects but also addressing issues previously neglected, such as emerging ethical dilemmas during research, the appropriate return of results, and the democratization of access to the knowledge generated.

In this regard, a promising strategy would be to reignite the discussion around the creation of RECs or establish specific regulations that are more aligned with the particularities of Education and the Human and Social Sciences. These fields, with their distinct methodologies and study objects from those typical of Health Sciences, require a less rigid approach and one that is more adapted to their specificities. This would not only favor the execution of more ethical and relevant research but also allow these committees to offer more integrated and continuous guidelines and oversight throughout the entire research process (Mainardes, 2017).

However, the implementation of these changes involves overcoming substantial operational challenges, such as excessive workloads and staff shortages, in addition to the institutional and bureaucratic demands that often overwhelm RECs. Therefore, it is essential to expand the academic debate on these issues, simultaneously investing in ethical training and research capacity building. Such investment should start in primary education and extend to postgraduate studies, ensuring that the next generation of researchers is better equipped to conduct ethical and socially responsible research. encourage research practices grounded in ethics, marking firm steps toward the desired progress in this field.

Final considerations

In light of the challenges faced in scientific research, it is fundamental to foster a robust ethical culture, not only within RECs but also among researchers, academics, and the general public. This collective effort aims not only to comply with existing norms but also to promote spaces for reflection and critical discussion about the ethical principles that guide research. Thus, education and continuous improvement of all those involved in science, research, and ethics become imperatives for establishing a foundation of mutual trust and transparency.

Within this context, ethical dilemmas emerge at various stages of the research process that require careful planning and approach by researchers. The proper anticipation and management of these dilemmas are crucial to ensuring the integrity and ethics of research, emphasizing the need for constant reflection and dialogue on best practices within the academic and scientific communities. Therefore, all stakeholders, including participants with varying levels of educational background, must be informed and consciously involved in the research processes, thereby ensuring accountability at all levels.

In concluding this discussion, it is imperative to recognize the essential role of ethics in research and the social commitment of improving the population's quality of life. Research, especially in the Humanities, specifically in the field of Education, transcends mere adherence to protocols and forms, demanding a deep engagement with social realities, grounded in moral and cultural values directed at emancipation and collective and individual well-being. Although research in the humanities is anchored in specific normative and evaluative principles, which are essential for fostering a robust ethical debate in the field, it is important not to neglect crucial aspects that are often overlooked. This perspective reinforces the importance of initiatives that encourage research practices grounded in ethics, marking firm steps toward the desired progress in this field.

References

Almeida, U. R., César, J. M., Luciano, L. dos S., & Carvalho, P. H.. (2018). A devolutiva como exercício ético-político do pesquisar. *Fractal: Revista De Psicologia*, *30*(2), 204–213.

Alves, D. A. D., & Teixeira, W. M. (2020). Ética em pesquisa em ciências sociais: regulamentação, prática científica e controvérsias. *Educação e Pesquisa, 46*, e217376, 1-20.

Barbosa, A. S., Corrales, C. M., & Silbermann, M. (2014). Controvérsias sobre a revisão ética de pesquisas em ciências humanas e sociais pelo Sistema CEP/Conep. *Revista Bioética, 22* (3), 482–492.

Barrow, J. M., Brannan, G. D., & Khandhar, P. B. (2024). Research ethics. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing.

Batista, K. T., Andrade, R. R. D., & Bezerra, N. L. (2012). O papel dos comitês de ética em pesquisa. *Revista Brasileira de Cirurgia Plástica, 27*(1), 150–155.

Beauchamp, T., & Childress, J. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics: Marking its fortieth anniversary. *The American Journal of Bioethics, 19*(11), 9–12.

Binsfeld, P. C. (2019). Sistema Nacional de Ética de Pesquisas com Seres Humanos. *Cadernos de Ética em Pesquisa, 1*(1), 17–30.

Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa. (2020). Cartilha dos direitos dos participantes de pesquisa - Versão 1.0. Recuperado de: https://conselho.saude.gov.br/images/comissoes/conep/img/boletins/Cartilha_Direitos_Participantes_de_Pesquisa_2020.pdf

Conselho Nacional de Saúde. (1996). Resolução CNS no 196, de 10 de outubro de 1996. Recuperado de: https://bvsms.saude.gov.br/bvs/saudelegi/cns/1996/res0196_10_10_1996.html

Conselho Nacional de Saúde. (2012). Resolução CNS no 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012. Recuperado de: https://bvsms.saude.gov.br/bvs/saudelegis/cns/2013/res0466_12_12_2012.html

Conselho Nacional de Saúde. (2016). Resolução CNS no 510, de 07 de abril de 2016. Recuperado de: https://conselho.saude.gov.br/images/comissoes/conep/documentos/NORMAS-RESOLUCOES/Resoluo_n_510_-_2016_-_Cincias_Humanas_e_Sociais.pdf

Dutra, H. S., & Reis, V. N. (2016). Desenhos de estudos experimentais e quase-experimentais: definições e desafios na pesquisa em enfermagem. *Rev enferm UFPE on line, 10 (6),* 2230-41.

Fernandes, N. (2016). Ética na pesquisa com crianças: ausências e desafios. *Revista Brasileira de Educação, 21*(66), 759–779.

Francischini, R., & Fernandes, N. (2016). Os desafios da pesquisa ética com crianças. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas), 33*(1), 61–69.

Guerriero, I. C. Z. (2016). Resolução no 510 de 7 de abril de 2016 que trata das especificidades éticas das pesquisas nas ciências humanas e sociais e de outras que utilizam metodologias próprias dessas áreas. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 21*(8), 2619–2629.

Mainardes, J. (2017). A ética na pesquisa em educação: panorama e desafios pós-Resolução CNS no 510/2016. *Educação, 40*(2), 160-173.

Miranda, J. de O. F., Santos, D. V. D., Camargo, C. L. D., Nascimento Sobrinho, C. L., Rosa, D. de O. S., & Souza, G. M. do S. (2017). Construção e aplicação de um termo de assentimento: relato de experiência. *Texto & Contexto - Enfermagem, 26*(3), e2460016.

Moro, C., Coutinho, A. S., & Pinho, G. (2023). Ética na pesquisa em Educação: desafios perante encaminhamentos sobrepostos à Plataforma Brasil. *Praxis Educativa, 18,* 1–17.

OPAS, & OMS. (2022). Catalisar a pesquisa ética em emergências: orientação ética, lições aprendidas com a pandemia de COVID-19 e agenda pendente. Recuperado de: https://www.paho.org/sites/default/files/opashssbiocovid19220019_por_1.pdf

Padilha, M. I. C. D. S., Ramos, F. R. S., Borenstein, M. S., & Martins, C. R. (2005). A responsabilidade do pesquisador ou sobre o que dizemos acerca da ética em pesquisa. *Texto & Contexto - Enfermagem, 14*(1), 96–105.

Vieira, C. M., & Omote, S. (2017). Aspectos metodológicos e éticos de uma pesquisa sobre mudanças de atitudes sociais de professores e estudantes em relação à inclusão. *Reflexão e Ação, 25*(3), 299-320. https://doi.org/10.17058/rea.v25i3.9727

Sigaud, C. H. de S., Rezende, M. A., Veríssimo, M. D. L. Ó. R., Ribeiro, M. O., Montes, D. C., Piccolo, J., Souza, J. M. de, & Marins, S. S.. (2009). Aspectos éticos e estratégias para a participação voluntária da criança em pesquisa. *Revista Da Escola De Enfermagem Da USP*, *43*(spe2), 1342–1346.

Article Information

Received on January 08th, 2025
Accepted on March 03rd, 2025
Published on June, xxth, 2025

Author Contributions: The author were responsible for the designing, delineating, analyzing and interpreting the data, production of the manuscript, critical revision of the content and approval of the final version published.

Conflict of Interest: None reported.

Article Peer Review

Double review.

Funding

No funding.

How to cite this article

APA
Vieira, C. M., Nonato, A. C., & Yonemotu, B. P. R. (2025). Reflections on ethics in scientific research: specificities of the field of education. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, 10, e19549.

ABNT
VIEIRA, C. M.; NONATO, A. C.; YONEMOTU, B. P. R. Reflections on ethics in scientific research: specificities of the field of education. **Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.**, Tocantinópolis, v. 10, e19549, 2025.