



Ethics assessment in different fields

Social sciences

Authors:

Agata Gurzawska, University of Twente

Rok Benčin, Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

(ZRC SAZU)

June 2015

Annex 2.d

Ethical Assessment of Research and Innovation: A Comparative Analysis of Practices and Institutions in the EU and selected other countries

Deliverable 1.1

This deliverable and the work described in it is part of the project *Stakeholders Acting Together on the Ethical Impact Assessment of Research and Innovation - SATORI* - which received funding from the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 612231



Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Ethical Assessment: Approaches and Principles	4
2.1 Ethical approaches and their relation to approaches in biomedical ethics	4
2.2 Ethical principles in the field and disciplines.....	5
3. Overview of Ethical Issues.....	10
3.1 Discussion of ethical issues.....	10
3.2 Social Sciences Researchers v. Social Science Research Ethics Committees.....	13
3.3 Social Innovation.....	14
4. Institutionalisation: EU and International	17
5. Institutionalisation: National	19
6. Evaluation.....	22
Annex 1: Key Publications, Journals and Conferences Series	23
Annex 2: List of Organisations.....	34

1. Introduction

This report on ethical assessment of research and innovation in social sciences is a part of a comparative study across scientific fields and disciplines within a wider analysis of EU and international practices of ethical assessment, made by the SATORI project. Ethical assessment in this analysis covers any kind of review or evaluation of research and innovation based on ethical principles. The report will focus on academic traditions of ethics assessment in the field, various types of (national and international) organisations involved in assessment and relevant legislation.

Social sciences are a group of academic disciplines that take human society as the object of their study, attempting to understand human behaviour, relationships and institutions within society. Traditionally, the group includes sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, law and political science, although there is no outright consensus on which disciplines should be included. A large number of subfields have and keep emerging, including human geography, cultural studies, business studies, communication studies, development studies, criminology, etc.

A wide range of ethical issues is discussed in the social sciences. Informed consent, confidentiality, avoiding harm, doing good, relations to peers and research integrity are all part of standard ethical guidelines in many of its disciplines. Even though this list may seem similar to issues in other scientific fields, especially in biomedicine, it is important to acknowledge that the nature and methodologies of social science research imply different kinds of ethical risks, especially concerning research participants. Potential for harm resides less in health and injury risks and rather in psychological distress and the danger of stigmatisation if sensitive private information is disclosed. Social scientists often emphasise the need to reflect the proper nature of these risks in ethical assessment protocols.

The institutionalisation of ethics assessment in social sciences gained pace in the 1980s and 1990s, when ethical review procedures, developed in biomedicine, were applied to research involving human participants in other fields. This application, however, has often been contested among social science researchers.¹ While some countries developed top-down uniform regulation, others left more room for bottom-up, field-specific approaches.² While all disciplines within the field have developed their ethical codes or guidelines, the application on biomedically-based procedures has been met with considerable resistance, since the nature of ethical issues in social sciences is different from those in medicine.

This report will explore approaches to ethical assessment in social sciences, the ethical principles these approaches refer to and ethical issues they address. The report will also focus on the nature and level of institutionalisation of ethical assessment practices within the field. A list of important institutions and a list of key publications are provided in the annexes. The report was compiled on the basis of studying important documents and journal publications of relevant topics. Additionally, several interviews were done with experts on ethics assessment in the field.

¹ Israel M., I. Hay, *Research Ethics for Social Scientists*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 2006, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 40, 58.

2. Ethical Assessment: Approaches and Principles

2.1 Ethical approaches and their relation to approaches in biomedical ethics

Although ethical discussions in the social sciences often take into consideration the underlying philosophical approaches to ethics, e. g., deontological, consequentialist, or care ethics approaches, it cannot be said that separate traditions of ethics assessment in the field have developed on the basis of different ethical models. The RESPECT project, funded by the European Commission to draw up ethical guidelines for socio-economic research,³ studied ethical codes in the social sciences and came to the conclusion that it “is generally agreed that ethical codes or frameworks [in the social sciences] include elements of several of these models”.⁴ New initiatives may however sometimes be developed based on specific ethical approaches. The “Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science” that are being developed by UK’s Academy of Social Sciences, are for example taking a step away from biomedically imposed principlism to explore the benefits of virtue ethics.⁵

Due to their dominance in shaping the practice of ethical assessment in general, biomedical approaches have had a major influence on thinking about ethics in social sciences.⁶ The four major international statements that are fundamental to research ethics – The Nuremberg Code (1947); The Declaration of Helsinki (1964); The Belmont Report (1979); CIOMS (1982) – therefore have been and are still relevant in social science, which like the biomedical sciences inherently entails research involving human subjects.⁷ In ethical assessments in the social sciences, the principles formulated by the Belmont Report and in principlist approaches in medical ethics generally – autonomy, beneficence and justice – are often referred to.

While ethical reflection is certainly not foreign to social sciences and can benefit from advanced discussions in biomedicine, many researchers have warned about the problems of “ethical review strategies based on biomedical experience [...] being applied to the work of social scientists”.⁸ Due to differences in ethical issues, discussed in the next section, ethically unproblematic research can be restricted by these review procedures while some real risks posed by social science research can be left unaddressed. Researchers’ struggles with biomedical approaches applied to social science by research ethics committees are a major topic of literature on ethics in the field, causing a growing divide between ethical conduct and compliance with regulations.⁹ Israel and Hay warn against top-down approach of applying the biomedical model in all fields and call form more bottom-up reflection, based on experience, derived from each field:

the apparent shift in ethical regulation in some countries from ‘bottom-up’, discipline- and institutionally sensitive approaches, to ‘top-down’, more centralized approaches may make it more likely that social scientists are subjected to regulations drawn up by bodies attuned more

³ <http://www.respectproject.org/main/index.php>.

⁴ Dench, Sally, Ron Iphofen and Ursula Huws, *An EU Code of Ethics for Socio-Economic Research*, The Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton 2014, pp. 6-7.

⁵ Cf. <http://acss.org.uk/developing-generic-ethics-principles-social-science/>.

⁶ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 24

⁷ Ibid., pp. 23–39.

⁸ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 40.

⁹ Cf. ibid., p. 1; Schrag, Zachary M., *Ethical Imperialism*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 2010 and his blog devoted to the topic: <http://www.institutionalreviewblog.com/>; Haggerty, Kevin D., “Ethics Creep: Governing Social Science Research in the Name of Ethics”, *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 2004.

to issues of biomedical and institutional risk than they are to the ethical concerns of social science research participants.¹⁰

Nevertheless, principles and issues such as avoiding harm and doing good, informed consent, confidentiality, etc., are the cornerstones of research ethics in the social sciences as much as they are in biomedicine. However, different topics and methods of research in the social sciences generate (as will be discussed in more detail in the next section) significant differences in the nature of risks and benefits and consequentially in the measures taken to avoid or achieve them. Applying ethical assessment framework, developed for biomedicine, may therefore misjudge the risks at stake in an individual research project in the social sciences.

The literature suggests that the scope of ethical assessment in the social sciences would benefit from the inclusion of socio-political principles such as liberty, equality, and justice.¹¹ Social research takes place in social contexts; therefore, socio-political concepts might be more effective than the traditional approach stemming from biomedicine.¹²

2.2 Ethical principles in the field and disciplines

Values and principles of social science research are addressed in a variety of regulations depending on a subdiscipline. There is, therefore, a multiplicity of codes and guidelines regarding different disciplines of social sciences. E. g., UK's Social Research Association (SRA) drafted its first ethical guidelines in 1980s and updated them at the turn of the millennium. The SRA Ethical Guidelines divide principles into four groups of "obligations": to society, to funders and employers, to colleagues, to subjects.¹³

The European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA) drafted the first version of the "Meta-Code of Ethics" in 1995. It includes four interdependent ethical principles:¹⁴

1. Respect for a Person's Rights and Dignity

Psychologists accord appropriate respect to and promote the development of the fundamental rights, dignity and worth of all people. They respect the rights of individuals to privacy, confidentiality, self-determination and autonomy, consistent with the psychologist's other professional obligations and with the law.

2. Competence

Psychologists strive to ensure and maintain high standards of competence in their work. They recognise the boundaries of their particular competencies and the limitations of their expertise. They provide only those services and use only those techniques for which they are qualified by education, training or experience.

3. Responsibility

¹⁰ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 58.

¹¹ Carpenter, D., "Discussion 'Stimulus' Paper for Symposium 1 (Principles)", *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, Issue 3, October 2013, p. 3. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Social Research Association, *Ethical Guidelines*, December 2013, p. 13-14. <http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf>

¹⁴ The European Federation of Psychologists' Associations, *Meta-Code of Ethics*. <http://ethics.efpa.eu/meta-code/>.

Psychologists are aware of the professional and scientific responsibilities to their clients, to the community, and to the society in which they work and live. Psychologists avoid doing harm and are responsible for their own actions, and assure themselves, as far as possible, that their services are not misused.

4. Integrity

Psychologists seek to promote integrity in the science, teaching and practice of psychology. In these activities psychologists are honest, fair and respectful of others. They attempt to clarify for relevant parties the roles they are performing and to function appropriately in accordance with those roles.

Across the variety of disciplines, however, similar principles and issues emerge. In *Research Ethics for Social Scientists* Israel and Hay highlight four basic principles: informed consent, confidentiality, avoiding harm and doing good, research relationships and integrity.¹⁵

Current discussion on the social sciences regards the possibility of developing generic ethics principles in social science research. The discussion focuses on the possibility to develop a principle-based ethics for the social sciences, but also on the desirability of such a framework. These principles would inform the public about the ethical nature of social science research in general.¹⁶

The UK's Academy of Social Science (ACSS) was one of the organisations that has initiated the discussion on the issue. In October 2013, the ACSS published a compilation of papers presented during the series of three symposia held in the spring of 2013 on the topic of *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*. The European Union, but also the US, New Zealand, and Canada have been undertaking programmes on the issue. The frustration towards translating biomedical principles into social science research has triggered the discussion on a principle-based approach in social science research. As the ACSS states, "(t)here has been growing international concern about the impact on the social sciences of systems for the governance of research ethics being inappropriately designed around the challenges presented by biomedical research and the principles that have informed their management."¹⁷ However, participants of the symposium clearly stated that "(t)he construction of a single set of principles aiming to guide the ethical design, research ethics review and ethical conduct of research might be challenging".¹⁸

In an interview for SATORI, Ron Iphofen, member of ACSS, explained that these generic principles are being agreed among representatives of various disciplines and applied according to disciplinary differences. One of the challenges in this regard is to overcome "domain protectionism". On the other hand, it is worth noting that discussions of ethics in psychology are sometimes closer to biomedicine than to social sciences, as confirmed by Vita Poštuvan, a member of the Board of Ethics at EFPA, in an interview for SATORI.

¹⁵ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, pp. 10-11.

¹⁶ Emmerich, N., "A Summary of Symposium 2: Values: 15th April 2013, British Psychological Society, London", *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, Issue 3, October 2013, p. 29. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>

¹⁷ The Academy of Social Sciences, *Developing Generic Ethics Principles for Social Science Research*. <http://acss.org.uk/developing-generic-ethics-principles-social-science/>.

¹⁸ Carpenter, D., "Discussion 'Stimulus' Paper for Symposium 1 (Principles)", *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, Issue 3, October 2013, p. 3. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>

In the European context, the RESPECT Code of Practice for Socio-Economic Research is of particular interest for addressing ethical principles and values common to social science research. The RESPECT project was funded by the European Commission's Information Society Technologies (IST) Programme. The RESPECT Code provides guidelines intended "to form the basis of a voluntary code of practice covering the conduct of socio-economic research in Europe".¹⁹ The Code does not impose new requirements or restrictions, but nevertheless intends to provide researchers with guidance on ethical conduct, raise public awareness of ethical issues and enable "development of a European Research Area with common standards that are transparent and universally agreed".²⁰ The Code provides three general principles: upholding scientific standards, compliance with the law, and avoidance of social and personal harm.²¹ RESPECT's EU Code of Ethics for Socio-Economic Research takes a step further and proposes the following list of principles, which it discusses in detail:

- The research aims of any study should both benefit society and minimise social harm.
- Researchers should endeavour to balance professional integrity with respect for national and international law.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that research is commissioned and conducted with respect for, and awareness of, gender differences.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that research is commissioned and conducted with respect for all groups in society, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion and culture.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that research is commissioned and conducted with respect for under-represented social groups and that attempts are made to avoid their marginalisation or exclusion.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that the concerns of relevant stakeholders and user groups are addressed.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that an appropriate research method is selected on the basis of informed professional expertise.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that the research team has the necessary professional expertise and support.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that the research process does not involve any unwarranted material gain or loss for any participants.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure factual accuracy and avoid falsification, fabrication, suppression or misinterpretation of data.
- Researchers should endeavour to reflect on the consequences of research engagement for all participants, and attempt to alleviate potential disadvantages to participation for any individual or category of person.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that reporting and dissemination are carried out in a responsible manner.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that methodology and findings are open for discussion and peer review.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that any debts to previous research as a source of knowledge, data, concepts and methodology should be fully acknowledged in all outputs.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that participation in research should be voluntary.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that decisions about participation in research are made from an informed position.
- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that all data are treated with appropriate confidentiality and anonymity.

¹⁹ RESPECT Project, *The RESPECT Code of Practice*. <http://www.respectproject.org/code/>

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ RESPECT Project, *The RESPECT Code of Practice*. <http://www.respectproject.org/code/>

- Researchers should endeavour to ensure that research participants are protected from undue intrusion, distress, indignity, physical discomfort, personal embarrassment, or psychological or other harm.²²

Another European-based set of guidelines, the *Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research*, published by UNESCO, has a more casuistic approach. These guidelines have been developed within the Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme fostering and promoting social science research.²³ Since 1994, the Programme promotes policy-relevant social science research and ensures the wide dissemination of the results of such work to a wide range of end-users including key decision-makers, different communities and social groups and representatives of civil society.²⁴ The primary purpose of the Programme is to transfer relevant social science research findings and data to decision-makers and other stakeholders through building efficient bridges between research, policy and practice.²⁵ The Guidelines have been developed “to provide a framework to guide research practice”.²⁶ They include nineteen ethical principles regarding, e.g., integrity of research, the relation between research risks and potential benefits, relations between researchers and the individuals and groups among whom they do their fieldwork, informed consent, providing adequate information by the researchers about their research in all publications, etc.

The guidelines published by the National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH) in Norway are particularly interesting due to its scope. The Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanities tackles such ethical issues as:

1. Research ethics, freedom of research and society (e.g. the importance of independent research; the communication and enforcement of research ethics standards);
2. Respect for individuals (e.g. respect for posthumous reputations; researchers’ responsibility for defining roles clearly);
3. Regard for groups and institutions (e.g. regard for the public administration; regard for private interests);
4. The research community (e.g. scientific integrity; plagiarism; verification and subsequent use of research material);
5. Contract research (e.g. the independence of researchers and research institutions; information about the funding of research);

²² <http://www.respectproject.org/ethics/guidelines.php>. For full document see <http://www.respectproject.org/ethics/412ethics.pdf>

²³ UNESCO, “Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme”. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/most-programme/>

²⁴ UNESCO, “Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST”, <http://www.unesco.org/most/ethical.htm>

²⁵ UNESCO, “Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme”, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/most-programme/>

²⁶ UNESCO, “Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST”. <http://www.unesco.org/most/ethical.htm>.

6. Science communication (e.g. participation in the social debate and responsibility for how research is interpreted).²⁷

The discussion about generic principles for social science research has triggered a further debate on the challenges related to this task. One concern is that researchers may skip reflection on the ethical implications of their work, and demonstrate an over-reliance on detailed guidelines and frameworks.²⁸ Another concern is that “over bureaucratisation could encourage researchers to circumvent procedures or not undertake innovative research”.²⁹ In order to avoid these scenarios, many researchers emphasise the importance of ethics awareness trainings. Some tools for ethical trainings have already been developed. One example of this kind of tool is the “ethics guidebook”³⁰ a web-based guide to help social science researchers, developed by the UK’s Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). The Guidebook helps researchers to address the ethical principles they should uphold in their research and acts as “a prompt for reflection and questioning at all stages of the research process”.³¹ Additionally, ethical guidance services have been established. The Social Research Association (SRA) in the UK has founded the Ethics consultancy forum, a free service supporting SRA members when they encounter ethical dilemmas in their research.³² The members can make a request or a question regarding their problem in an informal and confidential manner.³³

²⁷ The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH), *Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities*. <https://www.etikkom.no/In-English/Committee-for-Research-Ethics-in-the-Social-Sciences-and-the-Humanities/>

²⁸ Oates, J., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association p.3, <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ <http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/>

³¹ The Research Ethics Guidebook: a resource for social scientists. <http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/>

³² Social Research Association, “Ethics Consultancy Forum”, <http://the-sra.org.uk/research-ethics/ethics-consultancy-forum/>

³³ Ibid.

3. Overview of Ethical Issues

As seen in the previous section, a wide spectrum of principles has been established by various ethical codes in social sciences, ranging from benefiting society and avoiding harm to freedom and integrity of research, in addition to the protection of research participants (their dignity and privacy) and respect for vulnerable groups. While this set of principles might seem similar to the ones in biomedicine, differences come to the fore when applying these principles in the face of ethical issues, which often differ significantly from those in other fields.

3.1 Discussion of ethical issues

This section provides a brief discussion of the main ethical issues in the social sciences.³⁴

- *Voluntary and informed consent*

Informed consent is considered by many to be a cornerstone of research ethics, however, “in practice, the requirements of informed consent have proved to be anything but straightforward in the social sciences”.³⁵ Cultural differences need to be taken into account when approaching potential participants for informed consent and alternatives to written and signed consent need to be sought in cases where such consent is culturally foreign to participants.³⁶ According to ethical guidelines set out by the UK’s Association of Social Anthropologists (ASA), many “of the communities studied by anthropologists are highly suspicious of formal bureaucratic procedures and often of their state”.³⁷ In such cases, the “formal nature of the consent process that has been mandated by national codes or local committees has tended to compromise both the possibility of gaining genuine consent and of providing assurances of anonymity”.³⁸

As research progresses, consent may have to be renegotiated. Often, “the nature of the research and the emerging data may only become fully apparent as the study progresses”.³⁹ The unpredictable nature of social science research can make it difficult to report all the risks and measures taken to mitigate those risks to ethical committees in advance: “Given the open-ended and often long-term nature of fieldwork, ethical decision-making has to be undertaken repeatedly throughout the research and in response to specific circumstances.”⁴⁰ ASA’s guidelines also call for ethics committees to “recognise the diversity of methods of ethnographic research”.⁴¹

Obtaining consent from all participants is difficult when research involves observation of people in public spaces and the participation of crowds in large events or when investigating large institutions. Additional difficulties arise when these observations

³⁴ The selection of issues follows Israel & Hay op. cit., 2006, combined with other literature.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 75.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 63-64.

³⁷ Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth, *Ethical Guidelines for good research practice*, 2011, p. 2. <http://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml>

³⁸ Israel & Hay op. cit., 2006, pp. 74-75

³⁹ Dench & Huws, op. cit., 2014, p. 66.

⁴⁰ Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth, op. cit. 2011, p. 2.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 3.

are recorded on camera.⁴² Researchers have voiced concern over specific research being constrained due to consent regulations, e. g. research on homeless adolescents or work-place studies – cases where parental or management consent is impossible or difficult to obtain without restrictions.⁴³

There is an on-going debate in social sciences regarding the acceptability of covert research or research involving deception. Some researchers argue that such practices are justifiable in some cases, although they violate the principle of informed consent. It is often claimed in literature that some psychological phenomena cannot be studied without a certain level of deceit. Some research, e. g. in criminal behaviour, can only be carried out in a covert way. The EC's *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research* claims that in such and similar cases, “the personal interests of individual research subjects may be subordinated to more general social and collective interests”, meaning that exceptions to the principle of informed consent can be considered “in situations where the research cannot be effective if the research subjects are formally notified in advance of the topic of the research”.⁴⁴ The International Sociological Association's *Code of Ethics* states the following: “Covert research should be avoided in principle, unless it is the only method by which information can be gathered, and/or when access to the usual sources of information is obstructed by those in power.”⁴⁵ It is also worth noting that “there are many kinds of social research where the model of the powerful well-informed researcher and the vulnerable research subject does not apply”.⁴⁶ When faced with powerful political elites or corporate figures, “the right to withhold or withdraw consent (which is clearly appropriate for vulnerable and ill-informed research subjects) can leave SSH [social sciences and humanities] researchers seriously disadvantaged”.⁴⁷ In these cases, power relations may be reversed and researchers themselves can be exposed to risks.

- *Confidentiality and privacy*

Social scientists seek private information about research participants, sometimes of a sensitive nature. Confidentiality-related risks are therefore one of the main potential harms that can affect the participant: “While in some instances, the research activity itself could produce psychological discomfort or harm, in most cases the biggest risk in SSH research relates to the disclosure of a person's identity and insufficient protection of private information which may then lead to discrimination or

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ See Israel & Hay op. cit., 2006, p. 70; Bamber, Greg J., Jennifer Sappey, “Unintended consequences of human research ethics committees: Au revoir workplace studies?”, *Monash Bioethics Review*, July 2007, Volume 26, Issue 3, pp. S26-S36.

⁴⁴ European Commission, *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research (Draft)*, 2010, p. 11. http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/fp7/89867/social-sciences-humanities_en.pdf

⁴⁵ International Sociological Association, *EU Code*, p. 71.

⁴⁶ European Commission, *Guidance Note*, op. cit., 2010, p. 10.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

stigmatization.”⁴⁸ Researchers need to ensure that identifiers are removed in order to conceal the identities of participants.⁴⁹

In special circumstances, a researcher may be obliged to breach confidentiality: “For example, it is a legal requirement to report suspicions of child abuse. This can still put researchers in an ethically difficult situation.”⁵⁰ A SATORI interview respondent Vita Poštuvan explained that psychologists face similar dilemmas, e. g. on learning about the self-harming tendencies of an adolescent research participant. Further dilemmas arise if courts and other state authorities demand data gathered by a researcher.⁵¹

In some cases, however, participants wish to be named as they feel empowered by contributing their life stories and views: “In circumstances where individuals and groups have long been rendered voiceless and invisible, treating participants with dignity might include giving them the right to be identified and to have their contributions acknowledged.”⁵² Issues of ownership of the narrative material, provided by the participant, can also be resolved by such a voluntary disclosure of identity.⁵³

Researchers have to be wary of the changing demarcation between public and private in different cultures and through time. This could especially be an issue in internet research and contemporary phenomena such as social media.⁵⁴

- *Avoiding harm and doing good*

Risks of harm encountered in social science research differ from those in biomedical research: “Indeed, in social science, research harm is generally more likely to involve psychological distress, discomfort, social disadvantage, invasion of privacy or infringement of rights than physical injury.”⁵⁵ In many cases research itself is not the source of risk, but rather the use of acquired information, when “issues of expectation, interpretation, and representation” come to the fore;⁵⁶ e.g. issues related to the participant’s expectations of the outcomes and benefits of his or her participation, and how individual participants or communities are represented and their statements interpreted in the research outcomes. In some cases, though, more obvious harm can be done. For example, controversial (mis)use of psychological expertise was recently publicly discussed in the case of psychologists working on torture techniques in Guantanamo.⁵⁷ As regards research results, researchers “should avoid using classifications or designations that give rise to unreasonable generalisation, resulting in practice in the stigmatisation of particular social groups”,⁵⁸ especially minorities, the disabled, etc. Researchers should “reflect particularly deeply on the likely impacts

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

⁴⁹ Cf. Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, pp. 83-5.

⁵⁰ Dench & Huws, op. cit, 2014, p. 74.

⁵¹ Cf. Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, pp. 87-92.

⁵² Jacobson, Nora, Rebecca Gewurtz and Emma Haydon, “Ethical Review of Interpretive Research: Problems and Solutions”, *IRB: Ethics & Human Research*, 2007, 29 (5), p. 3.

⁵³ Cf. Dench & Huws, op. cit, 2014, pp. 72-74.

⁵⁴ Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth, *Ethical Guidelines*, op. cit, p. 5.

⁵⁵ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 96.

⁵⁶ Jacobson et al, op. cit., 2007, p. 3.

⁵⁷ See Ackerman, Spencer, “US psychology body declines to rebuke member in Guantánamo torture case”, *The Guardian*, 22 January 2014. This case was also brought up by the expert interviewee.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

on the communities/cultures/societies they are studying” and should base their research on “knowledge about and respect for local traditions”.⁵⁹

The study of sensitive issues by researchers, e. g. domestic violence or sex abuse, can be stressful for participants, although “in some studies, respondents (perhaps after initial feelings of distress) find discussing such issues to be therapeutic”.⁶⁰ Some social scientists argue that research should actively seek to benefit participants, especially vulnerable groups.⁶¹ Thus researchers should strive towards “mutually beneficial collaborative and participatory practices”.⁶²

As a minimal risk of harm is sometimes unavoidable, researchers have to “balance individual rights and public interest/common good”.⁶³ The Canadian Tri-council policy statement *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* also claims that “some research may be deliberately and legitimately opposed to the interest of the research subjects. This is particularly true of research in the social sciences and humanities that may be critical of public personalities or organisations.”⁶⁴

- *Peers and research integrity*

Ethical guidelines and literature discussed above also examine various aspects of research integrity and responsibilities towards profession and peers. This includes issues regarding cases of fabrication, falsification and plagiarism, redundant publications, bias in peer review, conflict of interest, etc. Relations within research teams and between researchers and their families are also discussed.⁶⁵ Issues related to the selection of methodology and responsible dissemination of results also feature in ethical codes.⁶⁶ In psychology, EFPA’s Meta-Code stresses the need for researchers and other professionals to recognise “the boundaries of their particular competencies and the limitations of their expertise” as the most important integrity-related principle.⁶⁷

3.2 Social Sciences Researchers v. Social Science Research Ethics Committees

As was mentioned above, social sciences have adopted some practices and language from biomedical research. This is unsurprising given that biomedicine is the most developed discipline in terms of ethical guidelines and research review. Increasingly, social science

⁵⁹ Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth, *Ethical Guidelines*, op. cit., p. 3; De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteer, *Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanities*, 2006, p. 24. [https://www.etikkom.no/Documents/Publikasjoner-som-PDF/Guidelines%20for%20research%20ethics%20in%20the%20social%20sciences,%20law%20and%20the%20humanities%20\(2006\).pdf](https://www.etikkom.no/Documents/Publikasjoner-som-PDF/Guidelines%20for%20research%20ethics%20in%20the%20social%20sciences,%20law%20and%20the%20humanities%20(2006).pdf)

⁶⁰ Dench & Huws, op. cit., 2014, p. 80.

⁶¹ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, pp. 100-101.

⁶² Ibid., p. 70.

⁶³ European Commission, *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research (Draft)*, op. cit., p. 9.

⁶⁴ Interagency Secretariat on Research Ethics, *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, Ottawa, 2005, p. i.7.

⁶⁵ For discussion on all these issues, see Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, chapter 8.

⁶⁶ Dench & Huws, op. cit., 2014, pp. 29-35, 51-53.

⁶⁷ <http://ethics.efpa.eu/meta-code/>

research projects are subject to review by ethical review boards, especially in the health sector, due to their broader socio-economic, cultural, historical and political contexts.⁶⁸ The ethical review guidelines and procedures “reflect an awareness of the problems of applying what seem to be universal principles of justice and law in different cultural, political and legal contexts, but also increase the bureaucratic requirements of research in these contexts”.⁶⁹

The growing institutionalisation of the ethics assessment of social science research has its critics who argue that adopting the biomedical paradigm and its model of research review in a social science context “offers nothing that might be even remotely helpful to sociologists in their search for ethics in research”.⁷⁰ For instance, Martin Sleat argues that there is a ‘clear difference between biomedical conceptions of harm and those in the social sciences, relating such profound differences to the varying natures of their research’.⁷¹ Thus, the question of the responsibilities of research committees and their members themselves was posed. Will C van den Hoonaard suggests that there is an imbalance between the virtues expected of researchers and the ones expected of ethics committees’ members themselves.⁷² Studying the Canadian *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, van den Hoonaard found that while researchers are required to have 23 virtues, requirements of members of ethics committees are not specified.

As far as research ethics committees (RECs) are concerned, John Oakes, Convenor of the British Psychological Society’s Working Party on Ethical Guidelines for Psychological Research suggests that they should be guided by four principles – independence, competence, facilitation and accountability.⁷³ All systems of scrutiny or review should be guided by one general principle – proportionality.⁷⁴ Therefore, ethics assessors should ensure that the level of scrutiny is proportional to the risk of harm.⁷⁵

3.3 Social Innovation

Social innovation, a relatively new area of social sciences, is another topic that is particularly interesting from an ethical point of view. Social innovation projects are being developed with a mission of helping others through applying theories from various social science sub-disciplines. There is no consensus on the definition of *social innovation*. In general, social innovation projects are developed to “meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations”.⁷⁶ In other words, these are new ideas, products, services, that are “both good for society and enhance society’s capacity to act”.⁷⁷ Practice, however, demonstrates the delicacy of this and that even good intentions can bring some serious ethical risks. The goal of social innovation is “supporting, developing, and enhancing the lives of the most

⁶⁸ Zwanikken, P., P. Oosterhoff, “Why a research ethics committee for social science? Reflections on three years of experience at the Royal Tropical”, *Medische Antropologie*, 23 (1), 2011, pp. 165-181, [p. 165].

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 167.

⁷⁰ van den Hoonaard, W.C., “Discussion Paper: Are we Asked to ‘Other’ Ourselves? Social Scientists and the Research-ethics Review Process”, *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, October 2013 Issue 3, p. 23. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 26-27.

⁷² van den Hoonaard op. cit., 2013.

⁷³ Oates, J., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association, p.3. <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Oates, op. cit.

⁷⁶ Murray, R., J. Caulier-Grice J., G. Mulgan, *The Open Book of Social Innovation*, 2010, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

marginalized, disenfranchised, and vulnerable populations, groups, and individuals in society”.⁷⁸ Social innovation is about improving the quality or the quantity of life and empowering individuals and communities, for example through implementing new labour market integration processes⁷⁹, ranging from the Internet to racial integration in sports leagues.⁸⁰ This kind of innovation is something more than introducing products and processes, it is about “satisfying end users’ needs and fostering their labour market potential”.⁸¹ Various definitions of social innovation exist (OECD, 2010c; Canadian Task Force on Social Finance, 2010), depending on the social purpose (e.g., microfinance, distance learning, etc.) or social process (e.g., open innovation).⁸² *The Open Book of Social Innovation* defines this notion as “as new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. In other words, they are innovations that are both good for society and enhance society’s capacity to act.”⁸³

Social innovation can be implemented in the public, private and non-profit sectors, but can also be initiated by civil society, with platforms required in order to facilitate cross-sector collaborative social innovation.⁸⁴ While business innovation is a profit-seeking innovation, social innovations “are not necessarily driven by the profit motive and business innovations need not be social innovations”.⁸⁵

Social innovation introduces a presumption that “because something is socially-oriented the motivation is likely to be ethically sound; that is principled, morally justified, and ethically

⁷⁸ The Council of Canadian Academies, *Innovation Impacts: Measurement and Assessment, The Expert Panel on the Socio-economic Impacts of Innovation Investments*, Ottawa, Canada, 2013, p. 65.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Pol, E., S. Ville, “Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term?” *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 2009, pp. 878–885, [p. 881].

⁸¹ The Council of Canadian Academies, *Innovation Impacts: Measurement and Assessment, The Expert Panel on the Socio-economic Impacts of Innovation Investments*, Ottawa, Canada, 2013, p. 65.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Murray, R., J. Caulier-Grice, G. Mulgan, *The Open Book of Social Innovation*, 2010, p. 3. *The Open Book of Social Innovation* recalls other definitions of social innovation: “Deiglmeier and Miller define social innovation as: “a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals. A social innovation can be a product, production process, or technology (much like innovation in general), but it can also be a principle, an idea, a piece of legislation, a social movement, an intervention, or some combination of them.” NESTA defines social innovation as: “innovation that is explicitly for the social and public good. It is innovation inspired by the desire to meet social needs which can be neglected by traditional forms of private market provision and which have often been poorly served or unresolved by services organised by the state. Social innovation can take place inside or outside of public services. It can be developed by the public, private or third sectors, or users and communities – but equally, some innovation developed by these sectors does not qualify as social innovation because it does not directly address major social challenges.” The OECD’s LEED Programme (Local Economic and Employment Development), which includes a Forum on Social Innovations, has developed its own definition. The Forum defines social innovation as that which concerns: “conceptual, process or product change, organisational change and changes in financing, and can deal with new relationships with stakeholders and territories. ‘Social innovation’ seeks new answers to social problems by: identifying and delivering new services that improve the quality of life of individuals and communities; identifying and implementing new labour market integration processes, new competencies, new jobs, and new forms of participation, as diverse elements that each contribute to improving the position of individuals in the workforce.” (Source: Murray R., Caulier-Grice J., Mulgan G., *The Open Book of Social Innovation*, 2010, p. 10).

⁸⁴ The Council of Canadian Academies, *Innovation Impacts: Measurement and Assessment, The Expert Panel on the Socio-economic Impacts of Innovation Investments*, Ottawa, Canada, 2013, p. 65.

⁸⁵ Pol E., S. Ville, “Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term?”, *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 2009, pp. 878–885, [p. 881].

legitimate”.⁸⁶ Despite its noble goal, social innovation may entail ethical issues related to trust, cooperation and commitment relations such as fraud, misrepresentation, and misappropriation of assets, conflicts of interest, misallocation of resources, or inadequate accountability and transparency (public and private sector).⁸⁷ In the non-profit sector, ethical issues may arise particularly in six areas: compensation, conflicts of interest, publications and solicitation, financial integrity, investment policies, accountability and strategic management.⁸⁸

The success factors of social innovations require in-depth analysis, taking into consideration different aspects of innovation:

- Impact: How much difference will the innovation make to improving the well-being of individuals or a community?
- Appropriateness: Will the intervention be affordable, robust and adjustable to the settings in developing countries, and will it be socially, culturally and politically acceptable?
- Burden: Will the innovation address the most pressing societal needs?
- Feasibility: Can the innovation be developed and deployed in a realistic time frame?
- Knowledge gap: Does the innovation improve the situation of individuals and communities by creating new knowledge?
- Indirect benefits: Does the innovation address issues such as environmental improvement and income generation that have direct or indirect positive effects on people’s well-being?⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Call for Papers: Special Issue on Social Entrepreneurship, Social Innovation and Business Ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics*, p. 2, http://www.springer.com/cda/content/document/cda_downloadocument/110518+CFP+JBE+SI++Chell_Spence+March+1+2012+Final1.pdf?SGWID=0-0-45-1149638-0

⁸⁷ Rhode, D. L., A. K. Packel, “Ethics and Nonprofits”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2009. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/ethics_and_nonprofits

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Based on the model of ethical social innovation in the area of health, presented by the Unite for Sight, *Ethics of Innovation*. <http://www.uniteforsight.org/global-health-university/ethics-of-innovation>.

4. Institutionalisation: EU and International

International ethical guidance for social science research is generally taken up by international academic and professional associations in a specific discipline. Efforts have also been made by international organisations that fund or otherwise support research.

The European Commission has taken steps to acknowledge the differences between fields in the ethics assessment procedures within its Framework Programmes. The *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research* was issued as part of FP7 documentation with the aim “to provide applicants and evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities research projects with advice and practical guidance on dealing with the ethical aspects of Social Sciences and Humanities research”.⁹⁰ The document was developed on the basis of discussion “among twenty-eight Ethics Experts with previous experience in Ethics Screening”.⁹¹

The *Guidance Note* states that “in many cases the ethical guidelines used by the ethical review boards are better suited to medical/bio-medical research than to SSH research”.⁹² According to this document, in order to properly assess ethical risks in social sciences and humanities research, acknowledgement of the differences between fields is crucial:

Professional associations of SSH have expressed their concerns and pointed out that if standard rules and procedures are followed in a blanket manner on the assumption that the same ethical principles apply in the same way to all research fields, this will do more harm than good (it may heighten the risk to the participants of research instead of protecting them, and even stop socially important research).⁹³

In the European context, the most significant ethical guidance is provided by the RESPECT project, which produced a voluntary code for European socio-economic research. The RESPECT guidelines are the result of collaboration between a number of European Institutes and Associations involved with social scientific research.⁹⁴ The RESPECT project aimed to develop “common European standards and benchmarks for socio-economic research” and to “contribute to broader ethical and professional debates within the socio-economic research community”.⁹⁵

Furthermore, UNESCO has published Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research that were developed in the Framework of M.O.S.T. (Management of Social Transformation) ‘to provide a framework to guide research practice’.⁹⁶

Principles and values of social science research are mostly addressed in a variety of professional ethics codes formulated for professions in different social sciences. International professional associations play a major part. One of the most recent documents in the area of psychology is the *Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists* adopted in

⁹⁰ European Commission, *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research (Draft)*, op. cit., p. 3.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid., p. 6.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ <http://www.respectproject.org/>

⁹⁵ Dench & Huws, op. cit., 2014, p. iii.

⁹⁶ UNESCO, “Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST”. <http://www.unesco.org/most/ethical.htm>

2008 by the tripartite endeavour of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) and the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP). The Declaration was created as a shared moral framework to “help members of the psychology community to recognise that they carry out their activities within a larger social context, and that they need to act with integrity in the development and application of psychological knowledge and skills and in a manner that benefits humanity and does not harm or oppress persons or peoples”.⁹⁷ The Declaration is based on four main principles: 1. respect for the dignity of persons and peoples; 2. competent caring for the well-being of persons and peoples; 3. integrity; and 4. professional and scientific responsibilities to society.⁹⁸

On the European level, the European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA) has established a Board of Ethics in which all 36 member countries are represented. In an interview for the SATORI project, Vita Poštuvan, a member of the Board explained that the aim of EFPA is to unify and harmonize ethics in the discipline across different European countries. Apart from its “Meta-Code of Ethics”, EFPA is developing guidelines for teaching ethics, media communications, forensic work etc. Currently, the organisation is developing a “Model Code of Ethics”, which will go beyond basic principles to offer advice on how to establish ethics committees, assessment procedures, etc., with the view to establishing a common European ethics framework for psychology.

The International Sociological Association published a Code of Ethics in 2001. Its primary goals are “(1) to protect the welfare of groups and individuals with whom and on whom sociologists work or who are involved in sociologists’ research efforts and (2) to guide the behaviour and hence the expectations of ISA members, both between themselves and toward the society at large”.⁹⁹

Since internet research has emerged as an important new method and subfield in social sciences, bringing about new ethical challenges, attempts were made to provide ethical guidance on the issue. Examples of guidance documents include: 1. Ethical decision-making and Internet research: Recommendations from the AoIR ethics working committee published by The Association of Internet Researchers;¹⁰⁰ 2. Research Ethics Guidelines for Internet Research by the Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities.¹⁰¹

Although journals and conference series devoted exclusively to ethics in social sciences are rare, the discussion on ethical principles and issues is nevertheless vibrant, as testified by numerous publications, conferences and workshops.

As for legislation, data protection and human rights acts have had a bearing on ethical considerations in the field.¹⁰² As research institutions could potentially be held accountable for violations of these acts, greater attention has been given to ethical assessment practices.

⁹⁷ The Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists, 2008, <http://www.sagepub.com/cac6study/pdf/UniversalDeclaration.pdf>

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ http://www.isa-sociology.org/about/isa_code_of_ethics.htm

¹⁰⁰ <http://aoir.org/documents/ethics-guide/>

¹⁰¹ <https://www.etikkom.no/In-English/Publications/Internet-research/>

¹⁰² Dench & Huws, op. cit., 2014, p. 3

5. Institutionalisation: National

Since the 1980s and 1990s, there has been an increasing trend towards the institutionalisation of ethics assessment in the social sciences, including the emergence of field-specific ethical guidelines, committees, journal issues, etc. However, there are significant differences from country to country regarding the level of institutionalisation reached.

Norway was the first country to establish a field-specific research ethics committee at national level. The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH) was founded in 1990. The committee reviews research project proposals submitted voluntarily. Their assessment is advisory. As explained by one of the committee members in an interview for SATORI, the advice by NESH is used to clarify cases in which it is unclear how ethical guidelines should be used, and/or to advise the researcher or research group in cases where guidelines are not applicable (e.g. if the research raises new ethical problems previously not discussed).¹⁰³ One of its aims was to design and regularly revise its *Guidelines For Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanities*, which provide a comprehensive analysis of ethical principles and issues in the field, helping “researchers and the research community be cognisant of their ethical views and attitudes, raise their awareness of conflicting standards, promote good judgement and enhance their ability to make well-founded decisions in the face of conflicting considerations”.¹⁰⁴ These guidelines also had an impact on national research ethics legislation; namely, NESH’s ethical guidelines were used as the basis for preparatory work in developing the Act on Ethics and Integrity in Research.¹⁰⁵ Currently, NESH is working on an up-to-date version of its *Ethical Guidelines for Internet Research*. NESH also organises seminars on research ethics and advises individual researchers.

In contrast to Norway, a working group involving Danish Social Sciences and Humanities Research Councils decided in 1990s, that “RECs were not necessary in these areas”.¹⁰⁶ The National Advisory Board on Research Ethics in Finland published *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review* in 2009. The document advises universities and other research institution on how to establish ethics committees and review procedures.¹⁰⁷

In Sweden, ethical assessment of all research “involving interventions using methods intended to physically or mentally influence the person participating in the research” is mandatory under the Ethical Review Act.¹⁰⁸ In an interview for SATORI, a Swedish expert in ethics review in social sciences warned that such juridification of ethics assessment could have the unwanted effect of reducing discussion on ethical issues to fulfilling legal requirements.

¹⁰³ Interview for SATORI.

¹⁰⁴ The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH), *Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities*. <https://www.etikkom.no/In-English/Committee-for-Research-Ethics-in-the-Social-Sciences-and-the-Humanities/>

¹⁰⁵ SATORI interview with NESH director.

¹⁰⁶ Holm, Sören, “The Danish Research Ethics Committee System, Overview and Critical Assessment”, Online Ethics Center for Engineering 6/14/2006, National Academy of Engineering.

<http://www.onlineethics.org/Topics/RespResearch/ResResources/nbacindex/nbachindex/hholm.aspx/>

¹⁰⁷ <http://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/ethicalprinciples.pdf>

¹⁰⁸ <http://www.eurecnet.org/information/sweden.html>

In the UK, ethical assessment practices in social science disciplines are taken up by two types of institutions: professional associations providing guidelines and codes, on the one hand, and universities establishing field or discipline-specific research ethics committees, on the other.¹⁰⁹ An example of the former is the Code of Human Research Ethics of the British Psychological Society.¹¹⁰ An example of the latter is King's College London, which established a Social Science & Public Policy, Law, Humanities Research Ethics Subcommittee that, in turn, comprises five discipline-specific research ethics panels: Arts & Humanities; Education & Management; Geography, Social Science, Health & Medicine; Law; War Studies Group.¹¹¹ This structure is not specific to the UK, however. National professional and scientific associations provide ethical guidelines in many other countries. Furthermore, universities across Europe are establishing their own field-specific committees in order to assess projects and their ethical implications. However, the ways in which universities deal with ethics and the structure of their committees do vary.¹¹²

Efforts are being made in the UK to unify ethical approaches in the field. In addition to the already mentioned "Generic Ethics Principles" initiative taken by the Academy of Social Sciences already mentioned, the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) introduced its detailed Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) in 2006.¹¹³ The framework "endeavours to preserve researchers' disciplinary affiliations; emphasizes their ethical reflexivity and responsibilities; and provides a thoughtful, consistent structure for social science ethics scrutiny".¹¹⁴

The two-fold system with ethical guidance in individual disciplines being in the domain of national professional and academic organisations while ethical assessment is being carried out internally in research institutions, mostly universities, seems to be the norm in most European countries. In absence of central national regulation, ethics committees and offices have been established at social science faculties and departments. This has been confirmed by SATORI country reports and interviews in the cases of Spain, Poland, Austria and the Netherlands. In Germany, similarly, the "social science ethics framework consists of non-binding codes of conduct, guidelines about good scientific practice, and ethic codes of the German professional associations and funding institutions".¹¹⁵

In many countries, ethics assessment remains a top-down practice, uniform throughout the research spectrum. One of the countries with such an approach is the USA. Since the 1980s, social scientists are "required to comply with rules they were essentially excluded from developing," which continues to cause conflicts between researchers and assessors.¹¹⁶ Many researchers feel that "IRBs regard all social research as if it poses the sorts of physical risks

¹⁰⁹ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 51.

¹¹⁰

http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/code_of_human_research_ethics_dec_2014_inf180_web.pdf

¹¹¹ See <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/index.aspx>

¹¹² Jenkins, R., "Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions", Social Research Association, p.9, <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>

¹¹³ <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/framework-for-research-ethics/>

¹¹⁴ Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 52.

¹¹⁵ Oellers, C., & E. Wegner, "Does Germany Need a (New) Research Ethics for the Social Sciences?" *Working Paper No. 86*, German Council for Social and Economic Data (RatSWD) 2009.

¹¹⁶ Oakes, J.M., "Risks and wrongs in social science research: an evaluator's guide to IRB", *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 26, No. 5, 2002, pp. 448, as quoted in Israel & Hay, op. cit., 2006, p. 42.

sometimes associated with biomedical research practices,” which means that ethical issues, specific to social sciences, are not properly addressed.¹¹⁷

The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) launched the Chinese Evaluation Center for Humanities and Social Sciences, which is committed to building an authoritative evaluation system for social sciences, including ethics evaluation.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ Israel & Hay, *op. cit.*, 2006, p. 44.

¹¹⁸ See <http://casseng.cssn.cn/>

6. Evaluation

The institutionalisation of ethics assessment in the social sciences is increasing, particularly since the 1990s. Experts in the field claim that this trend is “partly a consequence of legislative change in human rights and data protection, but also due to increased public concerns about ethical behaviour more generally”.¹¹⁹ In comparison to biomedical sciences, research in the social sciences is not subject to the same level of national and international regulation and legislation. Ethical guidance and standard setting in the social sciences is largely in the domain of national and international professional associations, although a number of countries have already implemented a national approach across the disciplines (Norway, UK). Numerous ethical guidelines and codes exist across social science disciplines, supplemented recently by initiatives to construct common guidelines and frameworks. In most countries, the ethical assessment of research projects is carried out internally at individual research performing institutions, e.g. by university ethics committees.

Ethical assessment frameworks, developed for biomedical sciences, have often been uncritically applied to the field, much to the frustration of social scientists. A great deal of literature on the topic is devoted to demonstrating that a field or discipline-specific approach is needed. While basic principles and issues – such as avoiding harm and doing good, informed consent, privacy and confidentiality – are equally as important in social sciences as they are in biomedicine, the nature of risk and ways of avoiding it are significantly different due to different objects and methods of research.

Experts in social sciences ethics assessment have claimed in interviews for SATORI that there is more room for research on ethics within the field and that further progress in developing frameworks would be welcome.

¹¹⁹ Dench & Huws, op. cit. 2014, p. 3.

Annex 1: Key Publications, Journals and Conferences Series

Key publications

- American Anthropological Association Statement on Ethnography and Institutional Review Boards, 2004. <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/irb.htm>.
- Baines, J. T., C. N. Taylor, “Ethical issues and dilemmas”, in F. Vanclay and A. M. Esteves (eds.), *New Directions in Social Impact Assessment – Conceptual and Methodological Advances*, UK and USA, 2011, pp. 97-113.
- Beyrer, Chris, and Nancy E Kass, “Human rights, politics, and reviews of research ethics”, *The Lancet*, 360/9328 (2002), pp. 246-251.
<http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736%2802%2909465-5/fulltext>
- Callahan, Sidney and Bruce Jennings (eds.), *Ethics, The Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*, Plenum Press, New York and London, The Hastings Center Series in Ethics, 2013.
- Carpenter, D., “Discussion ‘Stimulus’ Paper for Symposium 1 (Principles)”, *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, Issue 3, October 2013.
<https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>
- Economic and Social Research Council, Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010, Updated September 2012. http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/framework-for-research-ethics-09-12_tcm8-4586.pdf
- Emmerich, N., “A Summary of Symposium 2: Values: 15th April 2013, British Psychological Society, London”, *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, Issue 3, October 2013. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>
- ESRC, *The Research Ethics Guidebook: a resource for social scientists*, <http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/>
- Ethical and legal aspects of human subjects research on the internet.
https://nationalethicscenter.org/resources/187/download/ethical_legal.pdf
- European Commission, *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research (Draft)*, 2010.
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/fp7/89867/social-sciences-humanities_en.pdf
- European Research Ethics, *The Humanities and Social Sciences*, <http://www.ethicsweb.eu/ere/forskninghumsam.shtml>
- European Research Ethics. <http://www.ethicsweb.eu/ere/forskninghumsam.shtml>.
- Human Subjects and Privacy Protection.
<http://www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx>

- Institutional Review Boards and Social Science Research.
<http://www.aaup.org/report/institutional-review-boards-and-social-science-research>
- Iphofen, R., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association, <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>
- Israel M., I. Hay, *Research Ethics for Social Scientists*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 2006.
- Jacobson, Nora, Rebecca Gewurtz and Emma Haydon, “Ethical Review of Interpretive Research: Problems and Solutions”, *IRB: Ethics & Human Research*, 2007, 29 (5), p. 3.
- Jenkins, R., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association, p.9, <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>
- Mertens, Donna M., Pauline E. Ginsberg, *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. <http://www.sagepub.com/refbooks/Book230293>
- Murray, R., J. Caulier-Grice, G. Mulgan, *The Open Book of Social Innovation*, 2010.
- Nakray Keerty, Margaret Alston and Kerri Whittenbury (eds.), *Social Science Research Ethics for a Globalizing World: Interdisciplinary and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, Routledge, London, 2014.
- National Committees for Research Ethics in Norway, Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities.
<http://graduateschool.nd.edu/assets/21765/guidelinesresearchethicsinthesocialscienceslawhumanities.pdf>
- Oates, J., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association p.3, <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>
- Paoletti, Isabella, Maria Isabel Tomas and Fernanda Menendez, *Practices of Ethics: An Empirical Approach to Ethics in Social Sciences Research*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, 2013.
- Pol, E., S. Ville, “Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term?” *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 2009, pp. 878–885.
- RESPECT Project, Professional and Ethical Codes for Socio-Economic Research (European Commission). <http://www.respectproject.org/main/index.php>
- RESPECT Project, *The RESPECT Code of Practice*, <http://www.respectproject.org/code/>.

- Rhode, D. L., A. K. Packel, “Ethics and Nonprofits”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2009. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/ethics_and_nonprofits
- Sales, Bruce D., Susan Folkman (eds.), *Ethics in research with human participants*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US, 2000. <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=search.displayRecord&UID=2000-07971-000>
- Schrag, Zachary M., *Ethical Imperialism*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 2010.
- Social Research Association, *Ethical Guidelines*, December 2013, p. 13-14. <http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf>
- Summaries of Member Learned Society Statements of Research Ethics. <http://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Summaries-of-LS-Members-Statements-of-Research-Ethics.pdf>
- The Academy of Social Sciences, *Developing Generic Ethics Principles for Social Science Research*. <http://acss.org.uk/developing-generic-ethics-principles-social-science/>
- The Council of Canadian Academies, *Innovation Impacts: Measurement and Assessment, The Expert Panel on the Socio-economic Impacts of Innovation Investments*, Ottawa, Canada, 2013.
- The European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations, *Meta-Code of Ethics*. <http://ethics.efpa.eu/meta-code/>
- The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, Office of the Secretary, *The Belmont Report, Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*, 1979. <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.html>
- The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH), *Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities*, <https://www.etikkom.no/In-English/Committee-for-Research-Ethics-in-the-Social-Sciences-and-the-Humanities/>.
- The Unite For Sight, *Ethics of Innovation*, <http://www.uniteforsight.org/global-health-university/ethics-of-innovation>.
- UNESCO, “Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST”. <http://www.unesco.org/most/ethical.htm>.
- van den Hoonaard, W.C., “Discussion Paper: Are we Asked to ‘Other’ Ourselves? Social Scientists and the Research-ethics Review Process”, *Generic Ethics Principles in Social Science Research*, 3/2013, p. 23. <https://acss.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Professional-Briefings-3-Ethics-r.pdf>

- Witherspoon, S., “Ethics in Social Science: regulation, review or scrutiny? Summary of the plenary sessions”, Social Research Association. <http://the-sra.org.uk/files-presentations/summary.pdf>
- Zwanikken, Prisca, & Pauline Oosterhoff, “Why a research ethics committee for social science? Reflections on three years of experience at the Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam”. http://www.kit.nl/net/KIT_Publicaties_output/ShowFile2.aspx?e=1911

Journals

- Business Ethics Quarterly <https://www.pdcnet.org/beq>
- Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies <http://ejbo.jyu.fi/index.html>
- Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry <http://www.springerpub.com/product/15594343#.U0gus6I9ixM>
- Ethics & Behavior <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/hebh20/current#.U0gx1aI9ixM>
- GSTF Journal of Law and Social Sciences (JLSS) <http://www.globalstf.org/publications/jlss/code-of-ethics/>
- International Journal of Ethics in Social Sciences (IJESS) <http://www.crimbbd.org/call-for-paper-5/>
- International Journal of Humanities and Social Science <http://www.ijhssnet.com/index.php/journal/index/10>
- International Journal of Internet Research Ethics <http://ijire.net/index.html>
- International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies (IJ-SSHS) http://www.sobiad.org/ejournals/journal_IJSS/index.html
- International Social Science Review <http://www.globethics.net/web/international-social-science-review>
- IRB: Ethics & Human Research <http://www.thehastingscenter.org/Publications/IRB/About.aspx>
- Journal of Academic Ethics <http://link.springer.com/journal/10805>
- Journal of Business Ethics <http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/applied+ethics/journal/10551>
- Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=17800156703&tip=sid>
- Journal of Ethics in Mental Health - <http://www.jemh.ca/>
- Research Ethics <http://rea.sagepub.com/>

Conference series:

- Asia Pacific Research Ethics Conference (APREC) <http://www.aprec-nhg.com.sg/>
- Ethical Frameworks for Research Conference <http://www.open.ac.uk/research/ethics/news-old.shtml>
- FINDING COMMON GROUND? Research Ethics across the Social Sciences <https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/finding-common-ground-research-ethics-across-the-social-sciences-registration-9475458351>
- International Conference on Ethics in Human Research <http://www.icehr.org/>
- International Vincentian Business Ethics Conference <http://sbeonline.org/?p=6530>

- Public Responsibility in Medicine & Research (PRIM&R)
<http://www.primr.org/subpage.aspx?id=4286>
- Research Ethics at UK Conference
<http://www.aera.net/Newsroom/AERAHighlightsEnewsletter/AERAHighlightsJanuary2014/AERAExecutiveDirectorPresentsonResearchEthicsatUKConference/tabid/15346/Default.aspx>
- SEEP-Conference on Economic Ethics and Philosophy (discontinued)
http://nlbsearchplus.nlb.gov.sg/primo_library/libweb/action/search.do;jsessionid=FC12BFB0B26BB8A408968CF6702FB5DC?fn=search&vl%28freeText%29=SEEP-Conference+on+Economic+Ethics+and+Philosophy+%285th+%3A+1999+%3A+Kyoto%2C+Japan%29&tab=second&mode=Basic&scp.scps=&vid=SEARCHPLUS&vl%28187051362UI1%29=all_items&vl%28187051361UI0%29=creator
- World Business Ethics Forum (WBEF) <http://www.umac.mo/fba/wbef2014/>

International frameworks and protocols

(Source: A list based on the database of the European Commission – Research Ethics and Social Sciences <http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/index.cfm?fuseaction=public.topic&id=1433>)

- Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2004)
- Academy of Criminal Justice Science, Code of Ethics
- African Evaluation Association, African Evaluation Guidelines
- American Anthropological Association Statement on Ethnography and Institutional Review Boards, 2004
- American Anthropological Association, Code of Ethics
- American Association for Public Opinion Research, Code of Professional Ethics and Practices
- American Association for Public Opinion Research, Protection of Human Participants in Survey Research
- American Association of University Professors, Statement on Professional Ethics
- American Educational Research Association, Ethical Standards of AERA
- American Evaluation Society
- American Historical Association, Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct 2003
- American Political Science Association, Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science

- American Psychological Association (2002). Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 2002.
- American Psychological Association, Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct
- American Society for Public Administration, Code of Ethics
- American Sociological Association, Code of Ethics
- American Sociological Association's (ASA's) Code of Ethics, 1999
- American Statistical Association, Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice
- American Statistical Association, Surveys and Privacy
- APSA Guide to Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms, 2008
- Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct
- Association for Institutional Research, Code of Ethics
- Association of Internet Researchers, Ethical Decision-making and Internet Research
- Association of Social Anthropologists of the Commonwealth (1999), Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice
- Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth
- Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice, 1999
- Association of Social Science Researchers (New Zealand), Code of Ethics
- Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology, Code of Ethics
- Australian Computer Society, Code of Ethics
 - Authorship guidelines for academic papers
- Belgium: Fédération belge des psychologues, Code de déontologie
- Belmont Report (1979), National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural research: Ethical Principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research
- Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologinnen und Psychologen, Ethische Richtlinien der DGPs und des BDP
- British Association for Applied Linguistics, Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics
- British Educational Research Association (1992), Ethical Guidelines

- British Educational Research Association, Ethical Guidelines
- British National Union of Journalists, Code of Conduct
- British Psychological Society
- British Psychological Society (2000) Code of Conduct, Ethical Principles and Guidelines, Leicester, BPS.
- British Psychological Society (2000), Code of Conduct, Ethical Principles & Guidelines
- British Psychological Society, Code of Conduct for Psychologists
- British Society of Criminology, Code of Research Ethics
- British Sociological Association
- British Sociological Association
- British Sociological Association (2002) Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association.
- British Sociological Association (2003) Statement of Ethical Practice, Durham, BSA.
- Canadian Information Processing Society (CIPS), Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct
- Canadian Psychological Association (2000), Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists
- Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (1996). Feminist Research Ethics: A Process/Éthique en matiPre de recherche féministe: Un processus. Ottawa: CRIAW/ICREF.
- Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Code of Professional Ethics
- CDBI-CO-GT3 (2003)13 (PDF) The protection of the human embryo in vitro - Report by the Working Party on the Protection of the Human Embryo and Fetus
- Centre for Research Ethics Göteborg University
- Code of Ethics for the Psychologist
- Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association, 1998
- COMETH (98)13 Comparative study on the functioning of national ethics committees in 18 member States
- Council of American Survey Research Organisations (CASRO), CASRO Code of Standard and Ethics for Survey Research
- Dartington Social Research Unit, Youth at Risk Evaluation: Ethics Statement

- Dealing with sexual harassment
- Department for Work and Pensions (2003), *Doing the Right Thing: Outlining the DWP's approach to ethical and legal issues in social research*, (Jo Bacon and Karl Olsen), Working Paper No.11
- Economic and Social Research Council: *Research Ethics and Confidentiality*
 - Educational Program Evaluation Standards
 - Employment of staff
 - ESOMAR Arbitration service.
- ESOMAR - World Association of Opinion & Marketing Research Professionals (European Society for Opinion & Marketing Research)
- ESRC Research Ethics Framework (REF)
- Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice
- Ethical guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST
- Ethical Practice: Principles and Guidelines for Research with Vulnerable Individuals and Families PRAXIS: Research from the Centre for Children & Families in the Justice System
- Ethical Practitioners' Association of Canada (EPAC), Ethical Standards
- EthnicNet, Database for European Codes of Journalism Ethics
- EU-Code for Ethics for Socio-Economic Research-RESPECT project
- European Federation of Professional Psychological Associations (1995), *Meta code of ethics*
- Finland: National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH), *Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanities*
 - Free Prize Draws Guidance Note
- German Evaluation Society, *Evaluation Standards*
- Gesellschaft für Informatik, *Ethical Guidelines*
 - Good professional conduct
 - Guidance Note: How to Apply the MRS Code of Conduct in Employee Research
 - Guidance on the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations 2003

- Guidelines for Including People with Disabilities in Research
- Guidelines for Research Among Children and Young People
- Guiding Principles for Evaluators
- How to commission research
- Institute for the Management of Information Systems (IMIS), Code of Ethics
 - International Code of Marketing & Social Research Practices
- International Sociological Association, Code of Ethics
- International Statistical Institute, Declaration on Professional Ethics
 - Internet Privacy Policies and privacy statements
 - Internet Research Interim Guidance Note (also draft internet guidelines)
 - Interviewing children & young people
- Lawrence Hinman's Ethics Update site
 - Maintaining distinctions between marketing research and direct marketing
- Management of Social Transformations (MOST), Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST
- Market Research Society, Code of Conduct
 - Marketing & opinion research using the Internet
- Medical Research Council of Canada, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (1998). Tri-Council Policy Statement for Research Involving Humans.
- MRS Code of Conduct and related guidelines
 - MRS Guidelines on Mystery Customer Research
 - Mystery shopping
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Washington DC (formerly National Association of Foreign Student Advisers), Code of Ethics
- National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners
- National Association of Social Workers, Code of Ethics
- National Committee for Ethics in Social Science Research in Health (NCESSRH), Ethical Guidelines for Social Science research in Health

- National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities
- National Council on Ethics in Human Research (Ottawa)
- National Disability Authority
- National Union of Journalists, Code of Conduct
- NESH (2001) Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, law and the humanities. National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, Norway.
- NESH (2003) Research ethics guidelines for internet research. National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, Norway.
- New Zealand Psychological Society, Code of Ethics
- New Zealand Statistical Association, Code of Conduct
- Nuremberg Code
- Office for Human Research Protection, U.S. Department of Health and Social Services
- Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (2000). Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.
 - Opinion Polls
 - Personnel Evaluation Standards
- Philippine Health Social Science Association, Ethics for Social Research in Health: the phssa guidelines
 - Qualitative Research Guidelines (also see new revised draft)
 - Quantitative Data Collection Guidelines
 - Questionnaire Design Guidelines
- SABRE, An Ethical Code for Researching 'Race', Racism and Anti-racism in Scotland
- SEVAL-Standards: The Swiss Evaluation Society
- Social Research Association (2003) Ethical Guidelines.
- Social Research Association, Ethical Guidelines 2002
- Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council of Canada, Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans (Medicine, Science and Engineering, Social Sciences and Humanities)
- Society for Applied Anthropology, Statement of Ethical and Professional Responsibilities

- Sociological Association of Aotearo - New Zealand, Code of Ethics
- South African Political Science Association, Code of Ethics
- Spain: Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos Código deontológico del psicólogo
- SRA (2003) Ethical Guidelines, Social Research Association, London, December 2003
 - Statement of ethical practice
- Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association MARCH 2002
- Swiss Evaluation Society, Evaluation Standards
 - Tape & video recording & client observation of interviews and group discussions
 - The Responsibilities of Interviewers.
- UK Evaluation Society, Good Practice Guidelines
- UK Internet Service Providers Association (ISPA), Code of Practice 2002
- UNESCO Ethical Guidelines for International Comparative Social Science Research in the framework of MOST
- UNICEF Evaluation Office, Children Participating in Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) - Ethics and Your Responsibilities as a Manager, Evaluation Technical Notes, No.1, April 2002
- University of Toronto Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Board (SSH REB) Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Participant Observation
 - Using Emancipatory Methodologies in Disability Research
- WHO (2000) Operational Guidelines for Ethics Committees that Review Biomedical Research. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- Working Group on Ethical Review of Student Research in the NHS (2004) The Ethical Governance and Regulation of Student Projects: A Draft Proposal.
- World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki, Ethical Principles for Medical Research involving human subjects (Amended 2000)

Annex 2: List of Organisations

*Source: RESPECT Project: professional and ethical codes for socio-economic research in the information society; RESPECT for standards: database of organisations
<http://www.respectproject.org/standards/search.php>*

Association for Cultural Studies	Cultural Studies	International
ESOMAR – the World Association of Research Professionals*		International
International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE)	Economics	International
International Association for Media and Communication Research	Media and Communication Sciences	International
International Association for Social Science Information Service and Technology		International
International Association for the Study of Organised Crime	Law, Criminology and Penology	International
International Association of Science and Technology for Development	Socio-Technical Studies	International
International Council of Science		International
International Cultural Studies Society	Cultural Studies	International
International Economic Association	Economics	International
International Geographical Union	Geography	International
International Political Science Association	Political Science	International
International Sociological Association*	Sociology	International
International Social Science Council		International
International Union of Economists	Economics	International
International Union of Psychological Science	Psychology	International
SASE, Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics		International
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology	Psychology	International
Central and East European Studies Association		Europe

EUROGI – European Umbrella Organisation for Geographic Information	Geography	Europe
European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology	Psychology	Europe
European Anthropological Association	Anthropology	Europe
European Association of Social Anthropologists	Anthropology	Europe
European Association for the Advancement of Social Sciences		Europe
European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy	Economics	Europe
European Association of Experimental Social Psychology	Psychology	Europe
European Association for Population Studies	Demography and Statistics	Europe
European Association for Southeast Asian Studies (EUROSEAS)		Europe
European Association of Labour Economists	Economics	Europe
European Association of Law and Economics	Economics	Europe
European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology	Psychology	Europe
European Communication Association	Media and Communication Sciences	Europe
European Consortium for Political Research		Europe
European Economic Association	Economics	Europe
European Educational Research Association	Educational Science	Europe
European Federation of Psychologists Association*	Psychology	Europe
European Group for Organizational Studies		Europe
European Health Psychology Society (EHPS)	Psychology	Europe
European Network of Work and Organisational Psychologists	Psychology	Europe
European Society for Geography	Geography	Europe

European Society for Population Economics	Economics	Europe
European Union Studies Association		Europe
ARCISS, Association of Research Centres in the Social Sciences		United Kingdom
Association of Social Anthropologists*	Anthropology	United Kingdom
Association for Qualitative Research		United Kingdom
Association of Users of Research Agencies		United Kingdom
British Academy of Management	Business Studies	United Kingdom
British Association for Applied Linguistics*	Linguistics	United Kingdom
British Educational Research Association	Educational Science	United Kingdom
British International Studies Association*	Political Science	United Kingdom
British Psychological Society*	Psychology	United Kingdom
British Society for Population Studies	Demography and Statistics	United Kingdom
British Society of Criminology*	Law, Criminology and Penology	United Kingdom
British Sociological Association*	Sociology	United Kingdom
British Universities Industrial Relations Association	Sociology	United Kingdom
Economic and Social Research Council*		United Kingdom
Economic History Society	History	United Kingdom
Employees Research Group		United Kingdom

Ethnic Researchers Network			United Kingdom
Geographical Association	Geography		United Kingdom
Manchester Industrial Relations Society	Sociology		United Kingdom
Market Research Society*			United Kingdom
Media, Communications and Cultural Studies	Media Communication Sciences	and	United Kingdom
Operational Research Society			United Kingdom
Political Studies Association	Political Science		United Kingdom
Regional Studies Association			United Kingdom
Royal Economic Society	Economics		United Kingdom
Royal Geographical Society	Geography		United Kingdom
Royal Statistical Society	Demography Statistics	and	United Kingdom
Social Policy Association			United Kingdom
Social Research Association*			United Kingdom
UK Evaluation Society			United Kingdom
Berufsverband Deutscher Psychologinnen und Psychologen	Psychology		Germany
Berufsverband Deutscher Soziologinnen und Soziologen*	Sociology		Germany
Bundesverband Deutscher Volks- und Betriebswirte	Economics		Germany

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft		Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft	Educational Sciences	Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geographie	Geography	Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Politikwissenschaft	Political Science	Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Publizistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft*	Media and Communication Sciences	Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde	Anthropology	Germany
Deutsche Statistische Gesellschaft	Demography and Statistics	Germany
Deutsche Vereinigung für Politische Wissenschaft*	Political Science	Germany
Deutscher Verband für Angewandte Geographie	Geography	Germany
Gesellschaft für Arbeitswissenschaft	Labour Studies	Germany
Gesellschaft für Interdisziplinäre Wissenschaftliche Kriminologie	Law, Criminology and Penology	Germany
Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften-Verein für Socialpolitik	Economics	Germany
Verband Der Hoch-schullehrer für Betriebswirtschaft E.V.	Business Studies	Germany
Verband Deutscher Geographen An Deutschen Hochschulen	Geography	Germany
Association des Professionnels en Sociologie de l'Enterprise	Sociology	France
Association Française de Criminologie	Law, Criminology and Penology	France
Association Française de Science Politique	Political Science	France
Association Française de Sciences Economiques	Economics	France
Association Française de Sociologie	Sociology	France
Association Française des Anthropologues	Anthropology	France
Association Internationale des Sociologues de Langue Française	Sociology	France

Association Nationale des Organisations de Psychologues	Psychology	France
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)*		France
Société Française de Psychologie*	Psychology	France
Société Française de Statistique	Demography and Statistics	France
Société Française des Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication	Media and Communication Sciences	France
Société Géographie de France	Geography	France
Belgian Federation of Psychologists*	Psychology	Belgium
Belgian National Science Foundation		Belgium
Belgian Political Science Association	Political Science	Belgium
Belgian Psychological Society	Psychology	Belgium
Belgian Sociological Association	Sociology	Belgium
Flemish Political Science Association	Political Science	Belgium
Flemish Sociological Association	Sociology	Belgium
Societe Royale d'Economie Politique de Belgique	Economics	Belgium
Societe Royale Belge de Geographie	Geography	Belgium
Dutch Association for Social and Cultural Sciences	Cultural Studies	Netherlands
Dutch Political Science Association	Political Science	Netherlands
Dutch Society for Women Studies	Women's Studies	Netherlands
Nederlands Instituut van Psychologen	Psychology	Netherlands
Nederlandse Sociologische Vereniging	Sociology	Netherlands
NWO – the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research		Netherlands
Royal Dutch Geographical Society	Geography	Netherlands
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and		Netherlands

Sciences*		
Vereniging voor Statistiek en Onderzoek (VSO)	Demography Statistics	and Netherlands
Vereniging voor Statistiek en Operationele Research	Demography Statistics	and Netherlands
Austrian Academy of Science		Austria
Austrian Economic Association	Economics	Austria
Austrian Political Science Association	Political Science	Austria
Berufsverband Österreichischen Psychologinnen und Psychologen	Psychology	Austria
Österreichische Gesellschaft für Geographie	Geography	Austria
Österreichische Gesellschaft für Soziologie	Sociology	Austria
Österreichische Statistische Gesellschaft	Demography Statistics	and Austria
Associazione Antropologica Italiana	Anthropology	Italy
Italian Political Science Association	Political Science	Italy
Italian Sociological Association*	Sociology	Italy
Società Italiana Degli Economisti	Economics	Italy
Società Geografica Italiana	Geography	Italy
Società Italiana di Psicologia	Psychology	Italy
Società Italiana di Statistica	Demography Statistics	and Italy
Società Italiana Die Sociologia*	Sociology	Italy
Hellenic Economic Association	Economics	Greece
Hellenic Political Science Association	Political Science	Greece
Hellenic Sociological Association	Sociology	Greece
Asociación Castellano-Manchega de Sociologia	Sociology	Spain
Asociación de Estudiantes de Ciencia Política y Sociología*	Political Science	Spain
Colegio oficial de Psicólogos	Psychology	Spain

Consejo General de Colegios de Economistas de Espana	Economics	Spain
Federación Española de Sociología	Sociology	Spain
Spanish Association of Political and Administrative Science (AECPA)	Political Science	Spain
Associação dos Psicólogos Portugueses	Psychology	Portugal
Associação Portuguesa de Ciencia Política	Political Science	Portugal
Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia*	Sociology	Portugal
Ordem Dos Economistas	Economics	Portugal
Portuguese Association for Sociology of Industry, Organizations and Work	Sociology	Portugal
Irish Economic Association	Economics	Ireland
Political Studies Association of Ireland	Political Science	Ireland
Royal Irish Academy		Ireland
Science Foundation Ireland		Ireland
Sociological Association of Ireland	Sociology	Ireland
Danish Academy of Technical Sciences	Socio-Technical Studies	Denmark
Danish Economic Society	Economics	Denmark
Danish Political Science Association	Political Science	Denmark
Danish Psychologists' Association	Psychology	Denmark
Danish Research Agency		Denmark
Danish Society of Social Economics	Economics	Denmark
Danish Society for European Studies		Denmark
Danish Sociological Association	Sociology	Denmark
Royal Danish Geographic Society	Geography	Denmark
Icelandic Research Council		Iceland
Nordic Educational Research Association	Educational Sciences	Sweden
Swedish Economic Association	Economics	Sweden

Swedish Political Science Association	Political Science	Sweden
Swedish Research Council		Sweden
The Swedish Sociological Association	Sociology	Sweden
Finnish Psychological Society	Psychology	Finland
Finnish Anthropological Society	Anthropology	Finland
Finnish Demographic Society	Demographics and Statistics	Finland
Finnish Economic History Association	Economics	Finland
Finnish Economic Society	Economics	Finland
Finnish National Technology Agency	Socio-Technical Studies	Finland
Finnish Political Science Association	Political Science	Finland
Finnish Society for Economic Research	Economics	Finland
Geographical Society of Finland	Geography	Finland
Nordic Political Science Association	Political Science	Finland
The Westermarck Society/Finnish Sociological Society	Sociology	Finland
National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and Humanities (NESH)*		Norway
Nordic International Studies Association	Political Science	Norway
Norwegian Political Science Association	Political Science	Norway
Norwegian Psychological Association	Psychology	Norway
Norwegian Sociological Association	Sociology	Norway
Statsøkonomisk Forening	Demographics and Statistics	Norway
Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft	Anthropology	Switzerland
Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Geographie	Geography	Switzerland
Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Kommunikation- und Medienwissenschaft	Media and Communication Sciences	Switzerland
Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Psychologie	Psychology	Switzerland

Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Soziologie	Sociology	Switzerland
Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik	Demographics and Statistics	Switzerland
Schweizerische Vereinigung für Politische Wissenschaften	Political Science	Switzerland
Schweizerische Verband Akademischer Volks- und Betriebswirte	Economics	Switzerland
Swiss Society for Cultural Studies	Cultural Studies	Switzerland
Slovenian Academy of Sciences		Slovenia
Slovenian Political Science Organization	Political Science	Slovenia
Slovenian Sociological Association	Sociology	Slovenia
Association of the Geographical Societies of Slovenia	Geography	Slovenia
Slovak Political Science Association	Political Science	Slovakia
Slovak Sociological Association	Sociology	Slovakia
Hungarian Academy of Sciences		Hungary
Hungarian Economic Association	Economics	Hungary
Hungarian Political Science Association	Political Science	Hungary
Hungarian Psychological Association	Psychology	Hungary
Hungarian Sociological Association	Sociology	Hungary
Scientific Society of Telecommunications and Informatics		Hungary
Czech Academy of Sciences		Czech Republic
Czech Demographic Society	Demographics and Statistics	Czech Republic
Czech Economic Association	Economics	Czech Republic
Czech-Moravian Psychological Society	Psychology	Czech Republic
Czech Association of Political Science	Political Science	Czech Republic

Masaryk Czech Sociological Association	Sociology	Czech Republic
Polish Economic Society	Economics	Poland
Polish Political Science Association	Political Science	Poland
Polish Society for Political Studies	Political Science	Poland
Polish Sociological Association	Sociology	Poland
Croatian Academy of Sciences		Croatia
Croatian Economic Association	Economics	Croatia
Croatian Ethnological Association	Anthropology	Croatia
Croatian Political Science Association	Political Science	Croatia
Croatian Psychological Association	Psychology	Croatia
Croatian Sociological Association	Sociology	Croatia
Cyprus Economic Society	Economics	Cyprus
Cyprus Sociological Association	Sociology	Cyprus
Estonian Association of Sociologists	Sociology	Estonia
Estonian Economic Association	Economics	Estonia
Union of Estonian Psychologists	Psychology	Estonia
Latvian Academy of Sciences*		Latvia
Latvian Sociological Association*	Sociology	Latvia
Latvian Association of Anthropologists	Anthropology	Latvia
Lithuanian Academy of Sciences		Lithuania
Lithuanian Political Science Association	Political Science	Lithuania
Social Science Associations in Eastern Europe		
Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology*	Law, Criminology and Penology	Australia
Institute of Australian Geographers*	Geography	Australia
Canadian Political Science Association	Political Science	Canada
Canadian Psychological Association*	Psychology	Canada

Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association*	Sociology	Canada
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC)*		Canada
New Zealand Statistical Association*	Demographics and Statistics	New Zealand
Sociological Association of Aotearoa (New Zealand)*	Sociology	New Zealand
South African Political Science Association*	Political Science	South Africa
Association of Internet Researchers*		USA
Society for Applied Anthropology*	Anthropology	USA
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences*	Law, Criminology and Penology	USA
American Educational Research Association*	Educational Sciences	USA
American Political Science Association*	Political Science	USA
American Society for Public Administration*	Political Science	USA
American Sociological Association*	Sociology	USA