

Laud humphreys

Business



He worked in a psychiatric hospital in the sass's, where he learned about the use of psychoanalysis as a treatment for homosexuality, which was Hough to be a form of mental disorder In most parts of the united states in those days. Humphreys also worked as a priest for ten (10) years in a section of Chicago called Queens Parish, which was known for it's high population of homosexuals/ homosexuality. However, Humphreys reported that he wasn't Interested In the reform of homosexuals but was only Interested In studying them.

Between the years of 1965 to 1968 Laud Humphreys, an ordained Episcopalian minister, conducted a dissertation research on men who have impersonal sex with men (Humphreys, 1970). Humphreys stated that, " In the summer of 1965. I wrote a research paper on the subject of homosexuality. After reading the paper, my graduate advisor raised a question. The answer to which was not available from my data or from the literature on sexual deviance.

' But where does the average guy go lust to get a blow]bob? That's where you should do your research" (Humphreys, 1970, P. 6). Hence, Humphreys decided to do his research on the Tearoom Trade: Impersonal sex in public places' from a voyeur's perspective, which was acting as a participant. The distinguishing factors of the case are: The roles of the researcher, the taboo of the subject and the ethics. The roles of the researcher in this case included him acting as a participant (voyeur). He also assumed the role of the Watch queen', who was someone that walked from window to window, coughing and tapping his foot at any sign of Intrusion.

The taboo of the subject and the controversy surrounding the homosexuality at the time is probably the reason his research has become a classic. The fact that his research proved that more than half the participants were outwardly homosexual and married to women with families is also a factor in his case. Decoding a classic. However, its ten tattoo AT ten student Tanat en later salsa n caused him to deceive his participants into believing that his in-home surveys and questionnaires were based solely on men's health issues.

Personally, I find Humphreys' blatant disregard of ethics in this case study as crazy and irresponsible. This research is grossly unethical because Humphreys only got official consent from those who agreed to be known by the researcher, which were those who agreed to peak to him outside the restrooms. " Humphreys secretly followed some men and recorded the license numbers on their vehicles.

A year later, Humphreys showed up at their private homes and claimed to be a health service interviewer.

He asked them questions about their marital status, race, job, and other personal questions. " (" Charlotte", 1997) During the sass's when Humphreys conducted his research homosexuality was criminality in most States and men caught could be arrested and sentenced to years in prison for it. Therefore, if the police had gotten their hands on the data Humphreys had on these men or if their identities were in any way revealed then these men would have been severely stigmatized, their family lives ruined, they would have lost their jobs, or could have been arrested and imprisoned.

Humphreys contended that because the tearooms were in public areas he was indeed practicing disguised observations and that he protected his participants' identities by anonymity.

In an essay included in his 1970 text Humphreys does admit that taking and tracing license plates was questionable and Mathew regrettable (Humphreys 1970). However, he also stated “ on risk that his notes could have been seized to identify men engaged in illegal acts said he would have risked going to Jail rather than hand them over” (“ Charlotte”, 1997).