



The British
Psychological Society
Promoting excellence in psychology

Code of Human Research Ethics



If you have problems reading this document and would like it in a different format, please contact us with your specific requirements.

Tel: 0116 2254 9568; email mail@bps.org.uk.

Published by The British Psychological Society, St Andrews House,
48 Princess Road East, Leicester LE1 7DR.

© The British Psychological Society 2014

Contents

1.	Background	3
1.1	Introduction	4
1.2	Definition of terms	5
1.3	Why principles?	6
2.	The Principles	6
2.1	Respect for the autonomy, privacy and dignity of individuals and communities	8
2.2	Scientific integrity	9
2.3	Social responsibility	10
2.4	Maximising benefit and minimising harm	11
3.	Risk	13
4.	Valid Consent	15
5.	Confidentiality	22
6.	Giving Advice	23
7.	Deception	24
8.	Debriefing	26
9.	Principles of Best Practice in Ethics Review	27
9.1	The principles	27
	Independence	27
	Competence	27
	Facilitation	28
	Transparency and accountability	28
9.2	The role of a Research Ethics Committee	28
9.3	The constitution of a Research Ethics Committee	29
9.4	Training and development of Research Ethics Committee members	29
9.5	Monitoring	30
9.6	Devolved ethics review	30

10. Further Guidance	31
10.1 Safeguards for working with vulnerable populations	31
10.1.1 Children	31
10.1.2 Persons lacking capacity	32
10.1.3 Individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship	32
10.2 Research within the National Health Service	33
10.2.1 How to decide if your research requires NHS approval	33
10.2.2 The remit of NHS RECs	34
10.2.3 Applying for ethics review	35
10.2.4 The online application process (IRAS)	35
10.3 Independent practitioners	36
11. Student Research	37
12. Acknowledgements	41

1. Background

The revised British Psychological Society *Ethical Principles for Conducting Research with Human Participants* were published in 1990. This was a widely used document; many institutions and research funding bodies have used it to inform their own research ethics policies and practices. Since that time, additional supplementary guidance documents have also been published to support members conducting research in numerous different contexts. The Society appreciates that the understandings of ethics in research are constantly developing; in addition, other changes with significance for research ethics, such as the advent of the statutory regulation of professional psychological services by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), have taken place. The revisions of the Society's own *Code of Ethics and Conduct* (2006, 2009) have also influenced thinking in this area. For these reasons, this *Code of Human Research Ethics* has been produced.

The Working Party, Ethics Committee and Research Board thank all those people who were involved in its creation (see Acknowledgements at the back of this document) and encourage individuals and departments to use it as a resource for their own thinking and the continued development of ethical behaviour in psychological research.

Professor John Oates

Convenor, Working Party on the Code of Research Ethics

Dr Richard Kwiatkowski

Member of the Ethics Committee

Dr Lisa Morrison Coulthard

BPS Lead Policy Advisor

1.1 Introduction

This *Code of Human Research Ethics* sets out a set of general principles that are applicable to all research contexts and are intended to cover all research with human participants. Principles of conduct for psychologists in professional practice and working with non-human animals are to be found in the Society's *Code of Ethics and Conduct* and other advisory documents prepared by the Society (such as the *Guidelines for Psychologists Working with Animals*). It may also be helpful to consult the HCPC guidance.

Researchers should respect the rights and dignity of participants in their research and the legitimate interests of stakeholders such as funders, institutions, sponsors and society at large.

There are numerous reasons for behaving ethically. Participants in psychological research should have confidence in the investigators. Good psychological research is only possible if there is mutual respect and trust between investigators and participants.

Psychological investigators are potentially interested in all aspects of human behaviour and experience. However, for ethics reasons, some areas of human experience and behaviour may be beyond the reach of experiment, observation or other form of psychological intervention. Ethics guidelines are necessary to clarify the conditions under which psychological research can take place. However, as stated in the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, '...no Code can replace the need for psychologists to use their professional and ethical judgement' (2009, p.4, h). Fundamentally, 'thinking is not optional' (2009, p.5, k).

The principles outlined in this *Code of Human Research Ethics* supplement the general ethics principles in the Society's *Code of Ethics and Conduct*. Both sets of principles are tools for making reasoned judgement. Members of the Society are expected to abide by both the *Code of Ethics and Conduct* and also this *Code of Human Research Ethics*. Members should also draw the principles to the attention of research colleagues who are not members of the Society. Members should encourage colleagues, other organisations with whom they work and all researchers whom they supervise

(e.g. research assistants and postgraduate, undergraduate, A-level and GCSE students) to adopt them.

Additional guidance on specific aspects of psychological research ethics can be found on the Society's website (www.bps.org.uk), and queries about research ethics that cannot be answered by reference to this *Code of Human Research Ethics* or the additional guidance on the Society's website, can be addressed to the Society's Research Ethics Reference Group via research-ethics@bps.org.uk.

1.2 Definitions of terms

Throughout this *Code of Human Research Ethics*, the following terms are used:

'Research' is defined as any form of disciplined enquiry that aims to contribute to a body of knowledge or theory.

'Research ethics' refers to the moral principles guiding research from its inception through to completion and publication of results.

'Research Ethics Committee (REC)' refers to a multidisciplinary, independent body responsible for reviewing research proposals involving human participants to ensure that their dignity, rights and welfare are protected. The independence and competence of a REC are based upon its membership, its rules regarding conflicts of interest and on regular monitoring of and accountability for its decisions.

'Protocol' refers to a filed document which specifies for a research project the procedures for recruiting participants and gathering and managing data, with which all project staff agree to comply.

'Human participant' is defined as including living human beings, human beings who have recently died (cadavers, human remains and body parts), embryos and foetuses, human tissue and bodily fluids and human data and records (such as but not restricted to medical, genetic, financial, personnel, criminal or administrative records and test results including scholastic achievements).

'Participant' It is now common practice to refer to a person who serves as a data source for research as a 'participant'. This recognises

their active role and replaces the term ‘subject’ which has been viewed as portraying people as passive recipients rather than active agents. While the extent of active ‘participation’ in the research over and above providing information will of course vary greatly from one project to another, the use of the term ‘participant’ also serves to acknowledge the autonomy and agency of the individual in contributing to the research, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. We recognise that the term ‘subject’ has currency in certain contexts, such as describing research designs (e.g. ‘within-subjects’).

In psychological research it is also relevant to acknowledge that a participant’s understanding of the experience they have while taking part in the research will often be a valuable additional source of information and may well help to enrich the interpretation of findings.

People other than the individuals who are primary data sources may also need to be included in the consideration of the ethics of research. For example, parents and other relatives, and friends and colleagues may potentially be affected by research, and the ethical conduct of research will often need to be informed by the interests of other stakeholders as well, as noted above.

1.3 Why principles?

Research that involves humans addresses a wide range of topics and utilises many different methodologies. The types and severities of risks associated with human research range widely; from innocuous, anonymised at source data gathering on non-sensitive topics, to research carrying multiple high-level risks that demand very detailed ethics protocols and close attention to risk obviation, minimisation and management, along with adequate liability cover. Human research also involves a wide variety of target populations, some of which are vulnerable, lack full competence to consent or are otherwise associated with heightened risks. Increasingly, human research crosses institutional, professional and national boundaries, bringing further complication into the application of appropriate ethics protocols and review processes.

For these reasons, the development of detailed and specific regulations on the handling of ethics issues in human research by researchers, with the aim of covering all eventualities, is seen by many ethicists as an ultimately flawed direction of travel. As soon as one new set of regulations is finalised, a new method or topic of research is likely to emerge that is not covered. The existence of lengthy, detailed and prescriptive professional or institutional regulations raises the risk of researchers following the letter, but not the spirit, of the regulations and may in consequence lead to research being carried out that is ethically flawed. Overly detailed regulations may also make it more difficult for RECs to engage with the nuances of the ethics of individual cases.

A solution to such serious issues is a return to ‘first principles’. Ethical research conduct is, in essence, the application of informed moral reasoning, founded on a set of moral principles. In common with the Society’s *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, this *Code of Human Research Ethics* introduces the notion of underlying principles to inform psychological research practice. By openly stating the values that underpin our profession, at this historical point, we make them available for discussion and debate, as well as allowing the possibility of clarification and change.

Moreover, locating the responsibility for developing adequate ethics protocols firmly and squarely with researchers themselves can be achieved by appealing to explicit, core principles at a sufficiently high level of abstraction that the likelihood of individual cases falling outside of them is minimal. It is in this spirit that the following principles have been developed:

- Respect for the autonomy, privacy and dignity of individuals and communities.
- Scientific integrity.
- Social responsibility.
- Maximising benefit and minimising harm.

2. The Principles

2.1 Respect for the autonomy, privacy and dignity of individuals and communities

Value statement: ‘Psychologists value the dignity and worth of all persons equally, with sensitivity to the dynamics of perceived authority or influence over others and with particular regard to people’s rights including those of privacy and self-determination’ (*Code of Ethics and Conduct*, 2009, p.10).

Adherence to the concept of moral rights is an essential component of respect for the dignity of persons. Rights to privacy, self-determination, personal liberty and natural justice are of particular importance to psychologists, and they have a responsibility to protect and promote these rights in their research activities. As such, psychologists have a responsibility to develop and follow procedures for valid consent, confidentiality, anonymity, fair treatment and due process that are consistent with those rights.

Ethics standards: Psychologists have respect for the autonomy and dignity of persons. In the research context this means that there is a clear duty to participants. For example, psychologists respect the knowledge, insight, experience and expertise of participants and potential participants. They respect individual, cultural and role differences, including those involving age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race (including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin), religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation, education, language and socio-economic status.

Given this level of respect psychologists are naturally willing to explain the nature of the research to which participants are being asked to contribute, and to avoid any unfair, prejudiced or discriminatory practice, for example, in participant selection or in the content of the research itself.

For these reasons they accept that individuals may choose not to be involved in research, or if they agree to participate they may subsequently request that their data be destroyed. Under such circumstances researchers will comply with any requests that any related data be destroyed, and removed from any datasets. Where there are necessary time limits on data withdrawal, for example up to a point at which data are aggregated, these limits should always be made clear to participants.

Psychologists respect the autonomy of individuals by making reasoned judgments about any actions in the course of their research that will have an impact on the autonomy of participants, even temporarily, and will always avoid any processes and procedures where any long-term impairment or perceived impairment of autonomy might result. A reasoned balance should be struck between protecting participants and recognising their agency and capacity.

Researchers will respect the privacy of individuals, and will ensure that individuals are not personally identifiable, except in exceptional circumstances and then only with clear, unambiguous informed consent. They will respect confidentiality, and will ensure that information or data collected about individuals are appropriately anonymised and cannot be traced back to them by other parties, even if the participants themselves are not troubled by a potential loss of confidentiality. Where a participant wishes to have their voice heard and their identity linked with this, researchers will endeavour to respect such a wish.

In their research, as in all other professional dealings, psychologists will seek to ensure that people's rights are respected and protected.

2.2 Scientific integrity

Value statement: Research should be designed, reviewed and conducted in a way that ensures its quality, integrity and contribution to the development of knowledge and understanding. Research that is judged within a research community to be poorly designed or conducted wastes resources and devalues the contribution of the

participants. At worst it can lead to misleading information being promulgated and can have the potential to cause harm.

Ethics standards: Psychologists are committed to ensuring that the scientific and scholarly standards of their research are accountable and of sufficiently high quality and robustness. Quality relates primarily to the scientific design of the research and the consideration of potential risks of harm and protocols for addressing such difficulties (should they arise). It is important that the aims of the research are as transparent as possible to ensure that it is clear what the research intends to achieve.

Judgements of scientific value must be appropriate within the context in which the research is being conducted (e.g. the status of the researcher – student, lecturer, senior researcher). See also Section 11 on student research.

2.3 Social responsibility

Value statement: The discipline of psychology, both as a science and a profession, exists within the context of human society. Accordingly, a shared collective duty for the welfare of human and non-human beings, both within the societies in which psychology researchers live and work, and beyond them, must be acknowledged by those conducting the research (see also the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*).

Psychology education, science and practice are founded upon freedom of enquiry and debate. However, this freedom must be exercised in a manner consistent with ethics principles.

In whatever social context they work, psychologists should acknowledge the evolution of social structures in relation to societal need and be respectful of such structures. Unwarranted or unnecessary disruption should be avoided unless the psychologist judges that the benefits of intervention outweigh the costs of such disruption (for example, in the protection of vulnerable individuals or groups); (see also Section 1: Respect, of the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*).

Ethics standards: The aim of generating psychological knowledge should be to support beneficial outcomes. Such outcomes can be broadly defined as those that not only support and reflect respect for the dignity and integrity of persons (both individually and collectively) but also contribute to the ‘common good’.

Accordingly, psychologists must be able to work in partnership with others (including professional colleagues, research participants, and other persons); be self-reflective; and be open to challenges that question the contributions of psychological knowledge to society. Psychology researchers need to be aware of their personal and professional responsibilities, to be alert to the possible consequences of unexpected as well as predicted outcomes of their work, and to acknowledge the often problematic nature of the interpretation of research findings. They should always work within the limits of their professional competence.

2.4 Maximising benefit and minimising harm

Value statement: In accordance with Ethics Principle 3: Responsibility of the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, psychologists should consider all research from the standpoint of the research participants, and any other persons, groups or communities who may be potentially affected by the research, with the aim of avoiding potential risks to psychological well-being, mental health, personal values, the invasion of privacy or dignity.

Ethics standards: Psychology researchers should seek to maximise the benefits of their work at all stages, from inception through to dissemination.

Harm to research participants must be avoided. Where risks arise as an unavoidable and integral element of the research, robust risk assessment and management protocols should be developed and complied with. Normally, the risk of harm should be no greater than that encountered in ordinary life, i.e. people should not be exposed to risks greater than or additional to those to which they are exposed in their normal lifestyles. Where a tension arises between the legitimate needs of research and the avoidance of risk, reasoned

judgement should be applied, based on the principles in this *Code of Human Research Ethics*. If unavoidable additional risks are present, researchers should assess these risks for their probability and severity, and put in place measures to obviate, minimise and manage such risks.

Psychologists need to be sensitive to the potential impact of their interventions, for example, to the possibility of individual distress that may be caused unwittingly, to the danger of ‘normalising’ unhelpful behaviours or to creating self-doubt. A difference in power inevitably exists between researchers and participants, even if researchers seek to minimise it. Sensitivity is, therefore, essential, and caution is usually necessary. In conjunction with the previous section of this *Code of Human Research Ethics* it may be that researchers will need to consider the costs to the individual participant versus potential societal benefits. This is a difficult balance to strike and should be arrived at by careful and explicit analysis, and where appropriate, wider consultation with experienced colleagues, the relevant REC or user group(s).

Further discussion of risk in psychological research can be found in the following section.

3. Risk

Risk can be defined as the potential physical or psychological harm, discomfort or stress to human participants that a research project may generate. This is an important consideration in psychological research, where there is a wide range of potential risks. These include risks to the participant's personal social status, privacy, personal values and beliefs, personal relationships, as well as the adverse effects of the disclosure of illegal, sexual or deviant behaviour. Research that carries no physical risk can nevertheless be disruptive and damaging to research participants (both as individuals or whole communities/categories of people).

It is important to acknowledge that it can be difficult to determine all potential risks at the outset of a piece of research. However, researchers should endeavour to identify and assess all possible risks and develop protocols for risk management as an integral part of the design of the project, and ensure that appropriate levels of ethics review are sought.

The following research would normally be considered as involving more than minimal risk:

- Research involving vulnerable groups (such as children aged under 16; those lacking capacity; or individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship);
- Research involving potentially sensitive topics (such as participants' sexual behaviour; their legal or political behaviour; their experience of violence; their gender or ethnic status);
- Research involving a significant and necessary element of deception;
- Research involving access to records of personal or confidential information (including genetic or other biological information);
- Research involving access to potentially sensitive data through third parties (such as employee data);

- Research that could induce psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation or cause more than minimal pain (e.g. repetitive or prolonged testing);
- Research involving invasive interventions (such as the administration of drugs or other substances, vigorous physical exercise or techniques such as hypnosis) that would not usually be encountered during everyday life;
- Research that may have an adverse impact on employment or social standing (e.g. discussion of an employer, discussion of commercially sensitive information);
- Research that may lead to ‘labelling’ either by the researcher (e.g. categorisation) or by the participant (e.g. ‘I am stupid’, ‘I am not normal’);
- Research that involves the collection of human tissue, blood or other biological samples.

Some research may pose risks to participants in a way that is legitimate in the context of that research and its outcomes. For example, research to reveal and critique fundamental economic, political or cultural disadvantage and exploitation may involve elements of risk. Further, some research may be considered legitimate if the longer-term gains outweigh the short-term immediate risks to participants (provided that these risks are minimal and neither have lasting effects nor induce prolonged personal discomfort). In instances where an element of risk is an unavoidable element of the research design, a detailed case outlining the cost-benefit analysis and the risk management protocol should be submitted to the REC.

Risk analysis should not only be confined to considering the interests of the primary participants, but should also consider the interests of any other stakeholders. Where appropriate, the use of risk analysis tools may offer a useful way of identifying, quantifying and managing potential hazards.

4. Valid Consent

In accordance with the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, researchers should ensure that every person from whom data are gathered for the purposes of research consents freely to the process on the basis of adequate information. They should be able, during the data gathering phase, freely to withdraw or modify their consent and to ask for the destruction of all or part of the data that they have contributed.

The way in which consent is sought from people to participate in or otherwise contribute data for research should be appropriate to the research topic and design, and to the ultimate outputs and uses of the analyses. It should recognise in particular the wide variety of data types, collection and analysis methods, and the range of people's possible responses and sensitivities. The principle of proportionality should apply, such that the procedures for consent are proportional to the nature of participation and the risks involved.

For example, for data from existing datasets where consent was properly gained in the initial collection and this consent covers the uses of data proposed, no further consent will normally be needed. For anonymised-at-source, non-sensitive data, consent may be considered to have been given by the act of participation or by ticking a box, for example. Nevertheless, the risks involved in some anonymised-at-source research, for example, web-based research on sensitive topics such as sexual behaviours, will require carefully prepared prior information and clear consent processes.

When research involves the collection of identity capturing data on sensitive topics, using video or audio recording, or other methodologies where an individual may be identifiable, it is important to consider additional informed consent procedures. These procedures need to be related to both the nature of the data collected and the ultimate use of the data. Separate informed consent agreements for data collection and the dissemination of the study's results may be required.

Researchers should ensure that the protocol they follow for seeking, taking and recording consent is appropriate to local customs, legal frameworks and cultural expectations, and to the nature of the research and its topic, while adhering to the principle of validity. While written consent, as described below, will be the usual approach, other methods, such as audio-recorded verbal consent or implied consent (for example, in choosing to input responses to an anonymous online survey on a non-sensitive subject), may be preferable if based on a careful consideration of the research context. It is always important that consent should be documented in an auditable record.

Assessment of risk

A prior assessment of potential risks should inform the preparation of the information to be given to potential participants and the procedures for seeking consent. This assessment should be used to determine the appropriate form of consent and the nature of any risk management required. When in exceptional circumstances harm, unusual discomfort, or other negative consequences for the individual's future life might occur, the investigator must inform the participants clearly of these additional risks prior to consent. For all research where risks are present, secure liability insurance should be in place to adequately cover the levels of possible harm identified in the risk analysis.

Who can give consent? (see also Section 10.1)

The consent of participants in research, whatever their age or competence, should always be sought, by means appropriate to their age and competence level. For children under 16 years of age and for other persons where capacity to consent may be impaired the additional consent of parents or those with legal responsibility for the individual should normally also be sought. In special circumstances such as where it may be important that views of such participants or findings about them should not be suppressed, the rationale for not seeking parental consent should be clearly stated and approved by a REC.

In the case of very young children, and persons with very limited competence, their assent should be regularly monitored by sensitive attention to any signs, verbal or non-verbal, that they are not wholly willing to continue with the data collection.

If valid consent cannot be obtained from adults with severe impairments in understanding or communication, the investigator should consult a person well-placed to appreciate the participant's reaction, such as a member of the person's family, and must obtain the disinterested approval of the research from independent advisors. Where the research falls within the regulatory framework of the Mental Capacity Act, the Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act or relevant legislation in Northern Ireland, approval must be sought from a recognised REC.

Where competence to consent is in question, it should be assessed using a systematic procedure such as engaging the potential participant in a dialogue to explore their understanding of what it is that they are consenting to. This process may usefully include offering a choice to which the response indicates whether the individual is capable of making decisions based on likely outcome.

In relation to the gaining of consent from children and young people in school or other institutional settings, where the research procedures are judged by a senior member of staff or other appropriate professional within the institution to fall within the range of usual curriculum or other institutional activities, and where a risk assessment has identified no significant risks, consent from the participants and the granting of approval and access from a senior member of school staff legally responsible for such approval can be considered sufficient. Where these criteria are not met, it will be a matter of judgement as to the extent to which the difference between these criteria and the data gathering activities of the specific project warrants the seeking of parental consent from children under 16 years of age and young people of limited competence.

When research is being conducted with detained persons, particular care should be taken over informed consent, paying attention to the special circumstances which may affect the person's ability to give free informed consent.

Informing participants

Giving potential participants sufficient information about the research in an understandable form requires careful drafting of the information sheet. It is recommended that at least one pilot test of the processes for informing and debriefing participants be carried out with a naïve person having a literacy level at the lower end of the range expected in the planned research sample.

In certain circumstances the aims of the research may be compromised by giving full information prior to data collection. In such cases, it should be made clear that this is the case in the information sheet and the means by which the withheld information will be given at the conclusion of data collection should be specified. The amount of information withheld and the delay in disclosing the withheld information should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary.

The information sheet given to potential participants for them to keep should normally offer a clear statement of all those aspects of the research that are relevant for their decision about whether or not to agree to participation. The following list offers a series of headings for consideration. Not all of these will be relevant in specific cases.

- The aim(s) of the project.
- The type(s) of data to be collected.
- The method(s) of collecting data.
- Confidentiality and anonymity conditions associated with the data including any exceptions to confidentiality, for example, with respect to potential disclosures.
- Compliance with the Data Protection Act and Freedom of Information Act.

- The time commitment expected from participants.
- The right to decline to offer any particular information requested by the researcher.
- The opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time with no adverse consequences.
- The opportunity to have any supplied data destroyed on request (up to a specified date).
- Details of any risks associated with participation.
- If appropriate, a statement that recompense for time and inconvenience associated with participation will be given, without specifying the amount or nature of such recompense beyond the reimbursement of incurred expenses such as travel costs.
- The name and contact details of the Principal Investigator.
- The name and contact details of another person who can receive enquiries about any matters which cannot be satisfactorily resolved with the Principal Investigator.
- Details of any insurance indemnity for the research.
- Any debriefing that is planned.
- How the data will be used and planned outcomes.
- Potential benefits of the research.
- How the results of the research will be made available to participants.

Which of these headings are appropriate, and the extent of information given under each, will depend on the nature of the research. The language should be clear and accessible to people with limited literacy, using short words and sentences, written in the active voice, and avoiding the use of technical terms.

Sufficient time should be given for potential participants to absorb and consider the information given about the research and what is expected of their participation before they are asked to make a decision regarding participation.

Documenting consent

Consent, whether in a verbal recording, electronic or hard copy form, should include an explicit statement confirming that information about the research has been given to the participant and has been understood. It is important that participants do not misunderstand any collection of health-related data from them as constituting any form of medical screening. Such misapprehensions might lead them to be less vigilant in relation to seeking medical attention for risks or symptoms of illness.

Normally, where written consent is taken, two copies of a consent form should be signed by the researcher and the consenting participant, and/or their parent/guardian. One copy should be retained by the participant and the other stored by the researcher. The copy retained by the participant should give contact details of a person who may be contacted in the case of any queries arising. For certain types of research, for example where there are identifiable risks, it will also be appropriate for the consent to be witnessed and signed by an independent third party. All records of consent, including audio-recordings, should be stored in the same secure conditions as research data, with due regard to the confidentiality and anonymity protocols of the research which will often involve the storage of personal identity data in a location separate from the linked data.

It is crucial that participation in a research study is not coerced in any way, for example, through offering disproportionate rewards for consenting or indicating disincentives for not consenting. Coercion infringes the human right to autonomy and coerced participation compromises the validity of research data. Investigators should realise that they are often in a position of real or perceived authority or influence over participants. For example, they may be gathering data from their students, employees or clients, from prisoners or from other detained or vulnerable people. This relationship must not be allowed to exert pressure on people to take part in or remain in an investigation and the potential for a power relationship to bias the data should be considered. Similarly, where people in positions of power over potential participants, for example, school teachers or

prison staff, serve as gatekeepers or recruiters for research, the potential for coercion arising from the power relationships should be recognised and steps taken to avoid it. However, it is acceptable, and in many cases proper, for reasonable recompense for attendance, travel, other incurred costs and the time and inconvenience of participation to be offered.

Need for renewal of consent

Where the research requires a substantial commitment of time or repeated data collection sessions, such as in longitudinal studies, it will often be appropriate to seek renewed consent from participants. This also recognises that consent should be an ongoing process and that a fuller appreciation of the research and the nature of participation will often become more apparent to participants during the course of their involvement with the research.

Participants should be given information as to whom they may contact in the event of any issues arising in the course of the research that cannot be resolved with members of the project team. Such a contact should be both independent of the project team and also in a position to take appropriate action if issues are raised by participants.

5. Confidentiality

Subject to the requirements of legislation, including the Data Protection Act, information obtained from and about a participant during an investigation is confidential unless otherwise agreed in advance. Investigators who are put under pressure to disclose confidential information should draw this point to the attention of those exerting such pressure. Participants in psychological research have a right to expect that information they provide will be treated confidentially and, if published, will not be identifiable as theirs. In the event that confidentiality and/or anonymity cannot be guaranteed, the participant must be warned of this in advance of agreeing to participate.

The duty of confidentiality is not absolute in law and may in exceptional circumstances be overridden by more compelling duties such as the duty to protect individuals from harm. Where a significant risk of such issues arising is identified in the risk assessment, specific procedures to be followed should be specified in the protocol. Further details on matters concerning confidentiality will be found in the Society's *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, Section 1.2.

6. Giving Advice

In some kinds of investigation the giving of advice is ethical if this forms an intrinsic part of the research, is agreed with the participant and has been subject to ethics review in advance. In other circumstances, however, a researcher may obtain evidence suggesting the existence of psychological or physical problems of which a participant may appear to be unaware. In such a case, the investigator has a responsibility to discuss this with the participant if the investigator believes that by not doing so the participant's future well-being may be endangered. Where there is an identified risk of such evidence emerging it is good practice to prepare a protocol in advance and establish an appropriate referral route.

If, in the normal course of psychological research, or as a result of problems detected as above, a participant asks for advice about educational, personality, behavioural or health issues, caution should be exercised. If the issue is serious and the investigator is not competent to offer assistance, the appropriate source of professional advice should be recommended. Further details on the giving of advice will be found in the Society's *Code of Ethics and Conduct*.

7. Deception

To many outside the psychology profession, and to some within it, the idea of deceiving the participants in research is seen as quite inappropriate. The experience of deception in psychological research may have the potential to cause distress and harm, and can make the recipients cynical about the activities and attitudes of psychologists. However, since there are very many psychological processes that are modifiable by individuals if they are aware that they are being studied, the statement of the research focus in advance of the collection of data would make much psychological research impossible. There is a difference between withholding some of the details of the hypothesis under test and deliberately falsely informing the participants of the purpose of the research, especially if the information given implies a more benign topic of study than is in fact the case. This *Code of Human Research Ethics* expects all psychologists to seek to supply as full information as possible to those taking part in their research, recognising that providing all of that information at the start of a person's participation may not be possible for methodological reasons. If the reaction of participants when deception is revealed later in their participation is likely to lead to discomfort, anger or objections from the participants then the deception is inappropriate. If a proposed research study involves deception, it should be designed in such a way that it protects the dignity and autonomy of the participants.

Where an essential element of the research design would be compromised by full disclosure to participants, the withholding of information should be specified in the project protocol that is subjected to ethics review and explicit procedures should be stated to obviate any potential harm arising from such withholding. Deception or covert collection of data should only take place where it is essential to achieve the research results required, where the research objective has strong scientific merit and where there is an appropriate risk management and harm alleviation strategy.

Studies based on observation in natural settings must respect the privacy and psychological wellbeing of the individuals studied. Unless those observed give their consent to being observed, observational research is only acceptable in public situations where those observed would expect to be observed by strangers. Additionally, particular account should be taken of local cultural values and of the possibility of intruding upon the privacy of individuals who, even while in a normally public space, may believe they are unobserved.

See also the relevant sections of the *Code of Ethics and Conduct* and the Society's guidance on web-based research.

8. Debriefing

As outlined in the *Code of Ethics and Conduct* (Section 3.4), when the research data gathering is completed, especially where any deception or withholding of information has taken place, it is important to provide an appropriate debriefing for participants. In some circumstances, the verbal description of the nature of the investigation will not be sufficient to eliminate all possibility of harmful after-effects. For example, following an experiment in which negative mood was induced, it would be ethical to induce a happy mood state before the participant leaves the experimental setting.

9. Principles of Best Practice in Ethics Review

This section of the *Code of Human Research Ethics* sets out principles for ethics review outside of the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) system because the ethical conduct of research is concerned with broader issues than simply the conduct of research with participants; it includes the necessary element of independent review of ethics protocols. In many situations, such as in university psychology departments, there will be a local responsibility to ensure that ethics review complies with current best practice and with the expectations and requirements of sponsors, funding bodies and other stakeholders.

9.1 The principles

Independence

The ethics review process should be independent of the research itself.

Value statement: This principle highlights the need to avoid conflicts of interest between researchers and those reviewing the ethics protocol, and between reviewers and organisational governance structures. It is conditioned by the fourth principle, which requires recognition of the responsibility of RECs and the need to formulate this clearly. It also invokes the need for external membership of RECs (eschewing the problematic term ‘lay’). It is important to recognise the distinction between the review of research ethics and the subsequent governance of approved research, since independence is a core principle in the review process while different considerations may apply in the ongoing governance of research once approved through an ethics review process.

Competence

The ethics review process should be conducted by a competent body.

Value statement: This second principle addresses the need for research protocols to be properly evaluated by reviewers with

appropriate expertise, and highlights the need for careful consideration of the range of membership and ethics specific training of RECs.

Facilitation

The review process should facilitate the understanding and implementation of ethical practices.

Value statement: In addition to the core duty of responding to applications for ethics review with constructive responses, this principle invokes a responsibility to educate, inform and support researchers in the development of their research protocols. RECs should be responsive and avoid delaying valuable research.

Transparency and accountability

The review process should be accountable and open to scrutiny.

Value statement: RECs need to recognise their responsibilities and to be appropriately located within organisational structures that give transparency to the REC operation and procedures to maintain and review standards.

9.2 The role of a Research Ethics Committee (REC)

A REC is normally responsible for:

- reviewing all research involving human participants conducted by individuals employed within or by that institution;
- ensuring that ethics review is independent, competent and timely;
- protecting the dignity, rights and welfare of research participants;
- considering the safety of the researcher(s);
- considering the legitimate interests of other stakeholders;
- making informed judgements of the scientific merit of proposals; and
- making informed recommendations to the researcher if the proposal is found to be wanting in some respect.

9.3 The constitution of a Research Ethics Committee

A REC should normally:

- be multidisciplinary;
- include both men and women;
- include at least one appropriately trained external member with no affiliation with the department, university or research institution;
- be comprised of members with a broad experience of and expertise in the areas of research regularly reviewed by the REC; and must have the confidence and esteem of the research community;
- include at least one member with specialist knowledge in ethics;
- include individuals who reflect the ethnic diversity of the local community; users of specialist health, education or social services where these are the focus of research activities; individuals with experience of professional care or counselling; and individuals with specific methodological expertise relevant to the research they review; and
- be constituted so that conflicts of interest are avoided.

This would normally mean that a REC comprises at least seven members

9.4 Training and development of Research Ethics Committee members

The success of a REC relies largely on the degree to which research organisations are able to build appropriate structures and create a culture that recognises the central place that ethics review occupies in good research practice. Ethics training plays a central role in this process; such training should be on-going and become an integral part of research practice.

Successful RECs require agreed minimum standards of training and competence, which may be achieved through programmes at

institutional, faculty, departmental or research centre/unit level. The aim of the training should be to provide individuals with confidence in their abilities to conduct thorough and consistent ethics scrutiny of psychological research.

9.5 Monitoring

All research organisations should establish appropriate procedures to monitor the conduct of research which has received ethics approval until it is completed, and to ensure continuing review where the research design anticipates possible changes over time that might need to be addressed. Monitoring should be proportionate to the nature and degree of risk associated with the research. It should include consideration of best-practice procedures for the secure holding and preservation (or destruction where appropriate) of the data.

Where a REC considers that a monitoring report raises significant concerns about the ethical conduct of the study, it should request a full and detailed account of the research for full ethics review.

Where it is judged that a study is being conducted in a way that is unethical, it should consider the withdrawal of its approval and require that the research should be suspended or discontinued.

9.6 Devolved ethics review

In many organisations ethics review of individual protocols is devolved to departmental level committees. In the case of psychological research this will often mean that a department will have a devolved responsibility for reviewing protocols originating within the department. To avoid conflicts of interest and to assure best practice in ethics review, it is essential that responsibility for the conduct of ethics review should reside with a properly constituted committee with lay membership.

10. Further Guidance

This section gives consideration to aspects of human research ethics where additional risks are likely to be present. Further information on these can be found in the Ethics section of the Society's website.

10.1 Safeguards for working with vulnerable populations

Special safeguards need to be in place for research with vulnerable populations. Vulnerable populations include children under the age of 16, people with learning or communication difficulties, patients in care, people in custody or on probation, and people engaged in illegal activities, such as drug abuse.

In accordance with the Principle of Respect for the Autonomy and Dignity of Persons and the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, psychologists should ensure that participants from vulnerable populations (such as children, persons lacking capacity, and those in a dependent or unequal relationship) are given ample opportunity to understand the nature, purpose and anticipated outcomes of any research participation, so that they may give consent to the extent that their capabilities allow. Methods that maximise the understanding and ability to consent of such vulnerable persons to give informed consent should be used whenever possible.

Researchers should ensure that they are aware of the provisions of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and/or other legislation applicable in the location(s) of the research and any requirements with respect to ethics review of research, the provision of adequate liability cover, and the special requirements for gaining valid consent. Researchers should also be aware of and respond to the need for appropriate criminal records disclosures and clearances when their research involves contact with vulnerable people.

10.1.1 Children

If the vulnerable person is unable to give informed consent, consent should be sought from those persons who are legally responsible or appointed to give consent on behalf of persons not competent to

consent on their own behalf, seeking to ensure that respect is paid to any previously expressed preferences of such persons. In research with children under the age of 16, and in specific circumstances as described above in Section 4 on Valid Consent, researchers should ensure that parents or guardians are informed about the nature of the study and given the option to withdraw their child from the study if they so wish. The principle of monitoring the assent of the child will also apply.

10.1.2 Persons lacking capacity

In the specific case of persons lacking capacity to give valid consent, willing and fully informed consent for participation should be sought from a legally responsible proxy; and research without consent from a person should normally only occur if the research activity is considered to provide direct benefit to that person. Specific regulation applies to clinical trials. Further consideration and guidance on this matter is provided in the Society's guidelines on *Conducting research with people not having the capacity to consent to their participation*.

10.1.3 Individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship

Psychologists should be particularly diligent in establishing the valid consent of any person who is in a dependent or unequal relationship to them (e.g. student or client) and should ensure that appropriate consents are obtained from any gatekeepers to participants, for example school principals, parents or legal guardians.

Undergraduate participation in psychological experiments is not required for Society accreditation. It has to be recognised, however, that most psychological research involves human participants and that courses in psychology need to acquaint students with appropriate methods for carrying out such research. Participation by students in psychological research provides them with valuable experience, not just with methodology but also with the ethics problems that can arise when carrying out experiments and other forms of research. Indeed, it can be argued that it is unethical for psychology students or graduates to carry out research with others

unless they have been willing to participate, and have had experience of participation in such research themselves. As a consequence, this forms a normal part of undergraduate training. Students taking undergraduate laboratory classes in psychology, for example, typically recruit each other as participants, as well as recruiting participants other than psychology students for their research.

This *Code of Human Research Ethics* requires that there should be valid consent and no coercion in the recruitment of student participants. Given the non-invasive nature of most psychological research this generally does not present problems. However, in cases where problems with particular forms of research do arise, it is recommended that participants should be given alternatives so that there is no coercion to participate in any particular study. It is also recommended that, where research participation is a course requirement, this be clearly stated in course handbooks or other advertising material, enabling prospective students who do not wish to take part in research to opt for a different course.

10.2 Research within the National Health Service (NHS)

This guidance has been developed to summarise the ethics review process that applies to psychological research that requires NHS approval, which is organised through the National Research Ethics Service (NRES).

Ethics review for research involving the NHS is normally sought from a local REC except for research at multiple NHS sites, in which case the application is made through the central NRES system.

Detailed information about applying for ethics review for research in the NHS can be found on the NRES website.

10.2.1 How to decide if your research requires NHS approval

Not all projects undertaken within the NHS are classed as research. In particular, if your study is an audit or service evaluation then it will not normally be classed as research and, therefore, will not require NRES review. This does not mean that no ethics review is required; for example, research involving human participants that is

conducted by staff in a university will normally require review by the university REC even if NRES review is not required.

Guidance on determining where a research project falls within the NHS definitions can be found on the NRES website.

10.2.2 The remit of NHS RECs

NRES advises that:

Ethical advice from the appropriate NHS REC is required for any research proposal involving:

- Patients and users of the NHS. This includes all potential research participants recruited by virtue of the patient or user's past or present treatment by, or use of, the NHS. It includes NHS patients treated under contracts with private sector institutions.
- Individuals identified as potential research participants because of their status as relatives or carers of patients and users of the NHS, as identified above.
- Access to data, organs or other bodily material of past and present NHS patients.
- Foetal material and IVF involving NHS patients.
- The recently dead in NHS premises.
- The use of, or potential access to, NHS premises or facilities.
- NHS staff, recruited as research participants by virtue of their professional role.

(*Source:* NRES website, Requirements of Research in the NHS)

Furthermore if your study involves the following it will require ethics review by an NHS REC:

- A prison or a young offender institution.
- A private hospital/care facility and any of the patients who are there because they have been either referred by the NHS or the facility is under contract with the NHS.

(Source as above.)

If your research falls into any of the categories as described above then you will need to apply to an NHS REC for approval. If your research does not fall within this remit then the responsibility for approving the research lies with the organisation responsible for the research. It should also be noted that for those studying with a university, the university's ethics review processes should be engaged with to review and approve research proposals.

10.2.3 Applying for ethics review

Once you have established that NHS REC approval is required then you will need to engage with the NRES process.

It should be noted that the first point of call for researchers should be the Research and Development Office(s) of the NHS area(s) where it is planned to carry out the research (these can be approached via the Integrated Research Application System).

10.2.4 The online application process (IRAS)

Previously the process for applying for REC NHS approval required paper-based forms to be completed. However, since the introduction of the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) this method should be used to place all NHS REC applications. To access this system you should visit the NRES website.

Instructions and advice on how to complete the form are contained on the website.

It is important to ensure you have conditional funding before you make an NHS REC application as this will assist in ensuring that the application reaches REC review.

10.3 Independent practitioners

An increasing number of independent practitioners and researchers seek ethics review for their proposed research.

If the research is being conducted within the NHS, the individual should contact the NRES for further guidance.

If the research is not being conducted within the NHS, the individual should explore the possibility of obtaining ethics guidance and review from a local university. Universities usually have well established procedures for ethics review, and it may be the case that approval or sound advice could be obtained via this route.

If the research involves social care, it may be possible to obtain ethics review through the national Social Care Research Ethics Committee.

Should review through NRES or a University Research Ethics Committee not be possible, it is advised that the following overarching principles are followed. The individual should be able to demonstrate that:

1. their research proposal was reviewed by an independent person or persons competent to judge ethics standards;
2. they believed they had acted within the ethics standards laid down in relevant guidance documentation (such as the *Code of Ethics and Conduct* and this *Code of Human Research Ethics*); and
3. evidence to this effect could be provided if necessary.

At present, the Society is unable to provide ethics review or approval. It can only provide general guidance on the ethics principles of psychological research as set out in this *Code of Human Research Ethics* and the *Code of Ethics and Conduct*.

Advice can also be sought from the Society's Research Ethics Reference Group via research-ethics@bps.org.uk.

11. Student Research

Student research is expected to comply with the four principles as set out in this *Code of Human Research Ethics*. The following guidance should be interpreted by departments with reference to the principles and local circumstances.

All student research should be reviewed by at least two members of academic staff (at least one of whom should be a member of the Society or other appropriate professional organisation) on the basis of a written ethics protocol. In some circumstances generic approval for a research study that will be conducted by a number of students will be appropriate.

Student work sometimes falls into the same category as staff research; it may form part of a larger study and data may be intended for publication. If so, despite the likelihood that it will be closely supervised and will already have been granted ethics approval at project level, it should be the subject of the student's own independent ethics submission. (Where there is any discrepancy between requirements imposed for the student's ethics approval and staff project approval, these issues should be discussed with the supervisor concerned.)

The purpose of ethics review

Some student work will be conducted essentially or exclusively for training purposes (individually or as a class exercise). In this case, completing the ethics review procedure has a dual function: first, it is a teaching and learning experience, and second, as for any other ethics submission, it is a formal exercise that seeks to protect participants, researchers and other stakeholders from harm. In some cases, an ethics review application may be graded as an assessment, implying an acceptance that some student submissions will contain significant errors. If this practice is followed, a final version should be produced (agreed with the supervisor or other staff member) that is suitably corrected to comply with the formal requirements. Where the prime focus of a student project is training rather than

generating a novel research output, the training should include an acceptance of the limitations to contributions to knowledge of student research, while also inculcating recognition of the societal value of research.

'Fast-tracking' ethics approval

In most cases, student work will be non-controversial. If so, and if a 'fast-track' route is available for ethical approval, it should be used. Processes should be in place to identify where there are sufficient concerns about student work for fuller ethics review to be necessary.

This is desirable, especially since large numbers of student ethics submissions may need to be processed and signed off rapidly. Where such a 'fast-track' route is adopted, caution should be exercised since a student might believe a piece of proposed work to be entirely innocuous and raise no significant ethics issues, but close inspection might reveal otherwise. For example, a questionnaire on perceived body image, distributed among adolescent girls, was regarded by a student as factual and neutral but actually created considerable anxiety among the participants, requiring counselling follow-up. Accordingly, it should always be a staff member/supervisor who signs off 'fast tracking', not the student, and it is good practice, even in the case of routine research (for example, creating practice questionnaire items within a methodology class) that a sufficient description of the research is provided to allow a decision by the member of staff (or of the ethics committee) involved in the fast-tracking.

Where research is conducted as a class exercise, it is good practice for the responsible teaching staff member to have obtained a single, generic ethics approval for the protocol. However, even in this situation it can be a valuable exercise for students themselves to have to complete an ethics review proforma on at least one occasion for such an exercise, since it alerts them to the ethics issues that need to be considered when undertaking research, and it requires the student to read and think about the Society's ethics codes. Ethics review forms should require confirmation that the applicant has read and understood the Society's published codes. Further, it provides

valuable training in completing ethics review submission documents that will prove useful later in their careers when conducting research. Note that laboratory classes can sometimes raise significant ethics issues, such as a need to screen participants to exclude those with specific medical conditions, or ensuring, for example, that participants understand that to avoid ceiling effects in an experiment, no-one will achieve 100 per cent success in the task. Without such information, a participant might come away from the experiment with a feeling that they have ‘failed the test’, with consequent potential negative effects on their self-esteem.

Scientific integrity

Where a research proposal is submitted for work intended to contribute to the scientific literature, one aspect of ethics approval concerns the quality of the study (see earlier Section 2.2 on Scientific integrity) and whether participation, which occupies participants’ time, is warranted by its import and value. To avoid unnecessary replication, some ethics review procedures require a proposer to confirm that they have conducted an exhaustive literature search to ensure that the proposed project has not been conducted previously elsewhere and that the development of new methods is not being proposed where properly validated methods already exist to adequately address the research question. Although ethics review is primarily aimed at avoiding harm to participants, assessing the quality of a research exercise is also important. For example, an ethics assessor might detect a major design flaw, or believe that the exercise is so trivial as to be worthless. There may be occasions where allowing minor design flaws or other deviations from best scientific practice to be experienced can fulfil a valuable educational function. In such cases students should be made aware that this is the case. Clearly, where students test each other in class, such issues are of little consequence, since much can be learned by the student trainee, and participants, from the conduct of a flawed experiment. The flaw should be pointed out to the student in the course of conventional feedback from tutors rather than via an ethics refusal. Where, for a more substantial piece of scientific work, an ethics

reviewer detects what they believe to be a serious design flaw, this should be discussed in person with the applicant/supervisor, and referred to a third party as necessary, but this does not preclude the granting of ethics approval.

12. Acknowledgements

The first edition of this *Code of Human Research Ethics* was written by the Working Party on Ethical Guidelines for Psychological Research of the British Psychological Society. This second edition includes minor updates and revisions informed by a review of the *Code* by the Ethics Committee. Thanks are due to all members of the Working Party, all those who assisted in drafting earlier versions of this *Code* (in particular the Society's Ethics Committee, Michelle Dodson from the Economic and Social Research Council, Professor Alex Haslam, Professor Steve Reicher and Dr Carl Senior) and those who provided constructive and valuable feedback during the consultation phase.

The members of the Working Party are:

Professor John Oates (Convenor)

Dr Lisa Morrison Coulthard (Advisor)

Professor Julie Dockrell

Professor Julie Stone

Professor Nigel Foreman

Professor Priscilla Alderson

Professor Max Velmans

Professor Peter Clifton

Dr Richard Kwiatkowski

Dr Abigail Locke

Dr Romola Bucks

Dr Nick Maguire

Christine Grant

The British Psychological Society

St Andrews House, 48 Princess Road East, Leicester LE1 7DR, UK

Tel: 0116 254 9568 Fax: 0116 227 1314 E-mail: mail@bps.org.uk Website: www.bps.org.uk