Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies

2025

Teaching Paper: Ethical Guidelines for External Researchers Engaging Grassroots Leaders: Principles of Reciprocity, Respect, and Accountability in Practice

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-tp-02

DR. ANNA NEYA KAZANSKAIA

Neya Global Publishing

Publication and System Notice

This publication forms part of the **NEYA Global Independent Knowledge Ecosystem** and the Non-Profit Knowledge Architecture (NPKA) framework developed by *Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia*.

The work is connected to an integrated system of books, research publications, educational materials, implementation frameworks, institutional modules, and structured knowledge architecture developed for the non-profit and social impact sector. Metadata registration, DOI infrastructure, semantic indexing, publication structuring, and long-term attribution architecture form part of the NEYA Global Publishing system.

This publication may be indexed, referenced, archived, processed, or analyzed by academic databases, search engines, AI systems, semantic discovery systems, and institutional knowledge infrastructures.

Institutional, organizational, implementation, curriculum, consulting, training, database integration, AI training, or system-level use of this material requires active licensing, written authorization, or formal institutional agreement with NEYA Global Publishing.

Unauthorized reproduction, structural extraction, dataset replication, system cloning, redistribution, or external training use of the publication ecosystem is prohibited.

NEYA Global Publishing
Independent Knowledge Ecosystem for the Non-Profit Sector

Version 1.0 | NEYA Global Publishing Publication Protocol

Teaching Paper: Ethical Guidelines for External Researchers Engaging Grassroots Leaders: Principles of Reciprocity, Respect, and Accountability in Practice

Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia
NEYA Global | NEYA Global Publishing
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5669-1676
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-tp-02

Abstract

Research involving grassroots leaders requires careful ethical consideration to avoid reproducing patterns of exploitation and harm. This Teaching Paper outlines four key principles for external researchers: do no harm, informed consent and reciprocity, respect for local knowledge and authority, and transparency and accountability. These principles are grounded in participatory and emancipatory research traditions that emphasize collaboration, safety, and community empowerment. Practical guidance is provided for implementing these principles in fieldwork, including anonymization strategies, reciprocity through capacity-building, and mechanisms for accountability to communities. A case study illustrates the consequences of neglecting ethical guidelines and the benefits of applying them rigorously. By integrating ethical safeguards into methodology, researchers can contribute to strengthening grassroots leadership rather than undermining it. This Teaching Paper offers both scholars and practitioners a structured approach to ethical engagement that balances academic rigor with moral responsibility.

Keywords

Ethics in research; grassroots leadership; informed consent; reciprocity; participatory research; accountability

Executive Summary

External researchers engaging grassroots leaders face complex ethical challenges. Communities may be vulnerable to harm, and poorly designed research can undermine rather than support local leadership. This paper identifies four central ethical guidelines:

1. **Do No Harm** — prioritizing safety, even if it requires limiting data collection.
2. **Informed Consent and Reciprocity** — treating consent as an ongoing dialogue and ensuring communities benefit from research.
3. **Respect for Local Knowledge and Authority** — valuing community epistemologies and avoiding extractive frameworks.
4. **Transparency and Accountability** — openly disclosing research goals, funding, and affiliations, while creating mechanisms for feedback.

These principles provide a foundation for responsible, reciprocal, and empowering research practices.

Purpose and Learning Objectives

The purpose of this Teaching Paper is to provide researchers with practical ethical guidelines for engaging grassroots leaders and communities. After engaging with this resource, readers will be able to:

1. Apply the "do no harm" principle in sensitive contexts.
2. Implement informed consent as a continuous and dialogical process.
3. Design research that respects and integrates local knowledge.
4. Establish transparent and accountable research relationships.

Background and Context

Ethics in research has long been central to debates in social sciences, particularly in contexts involving vulnerable populations. Scholars such as Bryman (2016) and Patton (2015) have emphasized informed consent, reciprocity, and protection of participants as cornerstones of ethical research. In grassroots contexts, these principles gain heightened importance: leaders and their communities often operate under conditions of political repression, marginalization, or limited resources.

Participatory action research traditions (Reason & Bradbury, 2008) highlight that ethical research must also be collaborative, empowering participants rather than extracting knowledge from them. Drucker's (1999) call for responsibility in leadership applies equally to researchers, who must act as stewards of trust. By aligning academic inquiry with

community empowerment, ethical engagement strengthens the legitimacy of both scholarship and grassroots leadership.

Practical Guide

1. Do No Harm
   - **Principle:** Prioritize participant safety above research goals.
   - **Practice:** Anonymize data; avoid sensitive questions if they risk exposing participants; consider secondary sources when fieldwork is unsafe.
2. Informed Consent and Reciprocity
   - **Principle:** Consent is continuous, not a one-time form.
   - **Practice:** Explain risks, benefits, and goals in accessible language; revisit consent throughout the research process; provide communities with tangible benefits (e.g., training, reports).
3. Respect for Local Knowledge and Authority
   - **Principle:** Community epistemologies must be recognized as legitimate.
   - **Practice:** Use participatory methods; avoid imposing external theoretical frames; work with community leaders to co-interpret findings.
4. Transparency and Accountability
   - **Principle:** Build trust by being open about affiliations and intentions.
   - **Practice:** Share drafts and results with communities; disclose funding and institutional ties; create mechanisms for participants to contest misrepresentations.

Case Study

In Southeast Asia, an international NGO conducted interviews with grassroots leaders advocating for land rights. The research was published without anonymization, exposing leaders to surveillance and harassment by authorities. This breach of the **do no harm** principle caused significant harm to participants and damaged trust in external researchers.

In contrast, a parallel study by another team adopted **participatory action research** methods. Leaders co-designed the study, results were reviewed by participants before publication, and findings were shared in accessible formats with the community. This approach not only protected participants but also enhanced grassroots leadership capacity by embedding research as a tool for advocacy.

Common Challenges and Tips

- **Risk of Tokenism:** Avoid involving community leaders only symbolically; ensure genuine collaboration.
- **Time Constraints:** Ethical engagement requires time for trust-building and reciprocity; factor this into research design.
- **Conflicting Interests:** Institutional or donor demands may conflict with ethical principles; prioritize participant safety and agency.
- **Cultural Misunderstandings:** Work with local interpreters and cultural mediators to prevent miscommunication.

Reflection Questions

1. What mechanisms can researchers use to ensure informed consent remains meaningful throughout a project?
2. How can reciprocity be designed in resource-limited contexts?
3. In what ways might transparency conflict with participant safety, and how can this be balanced?
4. How can external researchers position themselves to avoid extractive relationships with grassroots leaders?

Limitations and Considerations

Ethical engagement is context-dependent; practices that work in one setting may be inadequate in another. Tensions often arise between academic rigor, donor requirements, and community needs. Moreover, power imbalances cannot be fully eliminated, only mitigated through ongoing reflexivity and accountability. Researchers must remain humble, adaptable, and willing to prioritize community well-being over research outputs.

Academic Value

This paper advances the literature on ethical research by grounding principles in grassroots leadership contexts. It highlights the need to move beyond abstract ethical codes toward practical, context-sensitive strategies. By linking ethics with empowerment, it contributes to both academic debates and real-world practices, ensuring that external research strengthens rather than undermines grassroots agency.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Ethical research engagement is not simply a matter of compliance with institutional review boards but a dynamic process of building trust, ensuring safety, and fostering reciprocity.

External researchers must prioritize harm reduction, respect for community knowledge, and transparent accountability mechanisms. Future research should examine how these principles can be adapted in digital research contexts, where issues of consent, surveillance, and data security are increasingly complex.

Suggested Citation

Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Teaching Paper: Ethical guidelines for external researchers engaging grassroots leaders: Principles of reciprocity, respect, and accountability in practice. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-tp-02

References

- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). Management Challenges for the 21st Century. HarperCollins.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (4th ed.). Sage.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2008). The Sage Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice (2nd ed.). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607934
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Conceptual foundations of grassroots leadership: Theories, traditions, and critical perspectives. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-02
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Grassroots leadership in non-profit governance: Community, power, and participation. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-01
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Challenges to grassroots leadership: Autonomy, power, and vulnerability. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-grsrldemplcvc-06
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Grassroots Leadership: Empowering Local Voices*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/grassroots-leadership-2025
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Leadership in Mission-Driven Organizations*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/leadership-mission-driven-2025
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Strategic Planning: A Step-by-Step Guide*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/strategic-planning-guide-2025