THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE GENEVA

INSTITUT DE HAUTES ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Geneva Graduate Institute Research Ethics Guidelines

1. Preamble

The present guidelines provide a general framework for ethical conduct of research to the members of the Geneva Graduate Institute research community, including faculty members, students, research personel and researchers. Ethical dilemmas may occur at different stages of research projects and relate to issues as diverse as choice of topics, methods or funders, the conduct of fieldwork or research abroad, the gathering and storage of data or the publication of results. The present guidelines are neither intended to be exhaustive nor apodictic but to offer guidance to researchers by identifying a series of ethical principles and standards germane to the design and implementation of their projects.

2. General Statement

The Geneva Graduate Institute is committed to the highest ethical standards and promotes a research environment based on the principles of good governance, non-discrimination, social responsibility, respect, honesty and integrity. Faculty members, students, research personnel, visiting reserechers and third parties undertaking research at, on behalf of, or in collaboration with the Geneva Graduate Institute are expected to share the same commitment and respect the dignity, rights and safety of research subjects, collaborating researchers, and communities they work with. Researchers should at all times comply with best practices to minimise risk and avoid harm, protect vulnerable groups and persons, respect confidentiality and privacy, and observe the legal provisions of Switzerland and the countries in which they are

operating. The Geneva Graduate Institute fully adheres to the principle of academic freedom and is convinced that the present guidelines in no way interfere with or curtail the independence of research but are its very precondition.

3. Code of Practice and Key Issues

It is the responsibility of faculty members, students, research personnel, visiting researchers and third parties undertaking research at, on behalf of, or in collaboration with the Geneva Graduate Institute to observe internationally accepted standards of ethics and integrity and to ensure the safety, dignity, and rights of all participants. Researchers are bound to follow the requirements and guidance of professional bodies in their field and to comply with the laws applicable in the jurisdictions in which they are operating. They should respect the terms and conditions of their contractual engagements (e.g. with granting agencies) and abide by the principles of ethical conduct and transparency in the management of their projects.

Particular caution and diligence is required when research involves or relates to:

- Vulnerable individuals or groups
- Protected or confidential data
- Politically or otherwise sensitive issues (e.g. sexual behaviour or preference, experience of violence or abuse, mental health, use of medical data, ethnic status, religious belief, criminal offences)
- Psychological stress or anxiety for participants
- Intrusive intervention or data collection
- Work in conflict zones, politically sensitive or otherwise dangerous environments
- Health and medical issues

In general terms risks to researchers and participants may be reduced by adhering to the following principles:

- **Do no harm**

  - Researchers are bound to prevent or minimize harm and possible adverse consequences for human subjects or groups in the contexts they are investigating.
  - In some cases, the principle of do no harm must be balanced against research's critical function and quest for truth (e.g. cases where research may reveal findings that expose illegal, illicit or otherwise noxious behaviour of individuals or collective actors especially when in positions of power).

- **Protection of researchers**

  - The safety of researchers and participants should be treated as imperative and their exposure to risk minimised
  - Places of investigation must be appropriate to the type of study.
  - Adequate risk assessment and liaison with the Institute's insurance officer/Human Resources Services is required prior to research conducted in conflict zones or dangerous environments (please refer to the internal

procedure - Intranet login required; students need to comply with the following field work guidelines).

- **Protection of vulnerable persons, groups and communities**

  - Vulnerable persons and groups include, amongst others, children and young people, prisoners, those with a learning disability, a cognitive impairment or a trauma, individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship or socially marginalised or persecuted groups. They should be treated with particular care, prudence and protection, especially regarding the collection of informed consent and data protection but also the choice of adequate research methodologies.

- **Collection of voluntary informed consent**

  - Researchers must obtain consent from research participants (1) when data is collected through surveys, interviews, interaction, or intervention; or (2) when behaviour of research participants is observed in a private context.
  - In order to obtain informed consent, researchers enter into an agreement with research participants that should address the purpose and anticipated consequences of the research; the identity of funders and sponsors; the anticipated uses of the data; possible harm or discomfort that might affect participants; and the degree of anonymity and confidentiality that may be afforded to informants and subjects.
  - Consent has to be free from exculpatory language and may not alienate any human rights.
  - Ideally, informed consent is obtained in writing. In situations where written consent is impossible, inadequate, or counterproductive, consent may be obtained orally. However, researchers are bound to keep records regarding consent and update them as needed.
  - Impairments to reasoning and judgment that may make it impossible for someone to give informed consent include mental illness, intoxication, or dementia. For persons who are legally incapable of giving informed consent or in case of vulnerable populations (children – any person below the age of 18 except where defined otherwise by national legislations) researchers must take special care to ensure that consent is not coerced. Appropriate permission may have to be gained from a legally authorized person, caretaker or gatekeeper.
  - Researchers may conduct research in public places or use publicly available information about individuals (e.g. observations in public places, analysis of public records, or archival research) without obtaining consent. However, the registration of behaviour using technical equipment (camera, video, tape recorders, etc.) requires consent.

- **Respect of confidentiality and anonymity**

  - As a general principle, conditions regarding the protection of confidentiality need to be transparently discussed by researchers with participants before the latter are given the choice to agree to participate, or not, in the research.

- In general, researchers should ensure the confidentiality of the data they collect on participants: they should ensure that the identity of the participants who agree to be part of their study should not be identifiable in the investigation outputs. Exceptions to this general rule exist: for instance, when participants are providing information as experts on general issues; when the disclosure of their identity may significantly add to the value of the research (e.g. oral history, ethnographic case studies); or when the participant agrees to identification even in the context of studies that do not fall in either of the first two cases. In all cases, participants need to explicitly consent to being identified and be given the choice to retain, or not, a right to review content associated with their name.
- Anonymity not only relates to the non-disclosure of names but also to the fact of rendering difficult or impossible the identification of specific people through cross-referencing data contained in a research output.
- Anonymity and confidentiality should be respected with particular diligence when dealing with sensitive personal data on race/ethnic origin, political opinions, gender or sexual orientation, religious beliefs, trade union membership, health (mental or physical) or details of criminal offences.
- In some instances, a provision of confidentiality may be unnecessary, e.g., when the human participant is a public figure or official spokesperson for an organization.
- Rights to confidentiality are limited by the fact that researchers are bound to avoid complicity in unlawful behaviour and prevent the occurrence of serious crime.

➢ **Principle of non-discrimination**

- Researchers should at all times treat colleagues and participants fairly, equally and without prejudice. Discrimination based on race, colour, gender identity or expression, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth and other status should be systematically countered, prevented and to the extent possible eliminated.

➢ **Good reference practice**

- The work of others should be adequately acknowledged and referenced in accordance with the rules of good academic practice in all research proposals, outcomes and publications.
- Researchers should abstain from fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.
- Researchers should give proper credit to the original source (including unpublished sources) when using the work, ideas and formulations of others.
- Researchers should adequately reference or quote their own earlier publications when reusing their published work.
- Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria. An author is someone who, through his/her own scientific work, has made a substantial contribution to a publication. Hierarchical,

managerial, financial or organisational support for a project or academic work does not in itself justify authorship.
- The order in which authors are listed should be clarified prior to submission and refer to the respective value of the contributions. In cases of equal contribution, alphabetical order should usually be employed.

➢ Data management and protection

- All data should be treated confidentially and used anonymously unless specified otherwise and agreed to by participants.
- Research data, including raw data, must be documented as comprehensively and clearly as possible and be preserved from accidental loss or destruction. Researchers should keep transparent, accurate records of all research, allowing verification and replication.
- Research data must be stored safely, protected from unauthorized access, preserved, and where necessary destroyed in compliance with the relevant regulations, including Swiss legislation, the provisions of funding agencies, and the guidelines of the Geneva Graduate Institute.
- Personal and sensitive data must be stored securely on password-protected drives as instructed by the Geneva Graduate Institute. Identifiers should be stored separately in locked files in offices protected by badge access. Highly sensitive data should, in addition, be encrypted.
- All data collected outside of Switzerland should cross borders electronically and be stored directly on the dedicated drive at the Geneva Graduate Institute via secured VPN connection. If local conditions prevent temporary access to VPN, data should be stored on password protected hard drives accessible only to the PI or the research team.
- Data should not be used for any other purpose than that for which it was originally obtained.

➢ International Collaboration

- In case of inter-faculty, inter-institutional collaborations, or (inter)national research consortia, partners have a shared responsibility to ensure the integrity of the research.
- Collaborating partners should establish a clear organizational chart defining the roles and responsibilities of partners and team members. They are encouraged to discuss important points such as: applicable laws and regulations; the use, management, sharing, and ownership of data and intellectual property; and the standards of authorship in publications.

➢ Avoidance of conflicts of interest

- Researchers should maintain the highest degree of integrity and avoid conflicts of interest. They should, in particular, refrain from conducting research in contexts where personal, professional, legal, financial or other interests or relationships may induce bias or partiality.

- Researchers should acknowledge the receipt of any financial support, sponsorship, or unique privileges and take appropriate action to prevent conflict of interest or disclose it to appropriate parties.
- Reviewers of academic papers and grant applications or members of hiring bodies should declare any potential conflicts of interest. If necessary, they should withdraw from the appointment or process on their own.

➢ **Commensurate compensations for research participants**

- Researchers should abstain from offering excessive or inappropriate financial or other inducements to obtain the participation of research participants, particularly when it might coerce participation. However, researchers may provide incentives and small compensations to participants so long as they are appropriate and proportional.

➢ **Preservation of the possibility of future research**

- Researchers should commit themselves to leave a research field in a state that does not preclude future access by other researchers.

4. Laws and Regulations

Faculty membersStaff, students, research personnel, visiting reserechers and third parties undertaking research at, on behalf of, or in collaboration with the Geneva Graduate Institute are bound to conform to applicable Swiss law, in particular the *Federal Act on Research Involving Human Beings* (HRA), the *Federal Act on Data Protection* (FADP), the regulatory requirements of the countries in which their research takes place, as well as to applicable international regulations and standards.

5. Research Integrity and Misconduct

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity defines the key pillars of scientific integrity as:

- **Reliability**: ensuring the quality of research in terms of design, methodology, analysis and the use of data and resources.
- **Honesty**: undertaking, reviewing, reporting and communicating research in a transparent, fair, full and unbiased way.
- **Respect**: adopting a mindful attitude towards team members, colleagues, research participants, society, cultural heritage, the environment and diversity in general.
- **Accountability**: managing research in a transparent and structured way including publications, training, supervision and mentoring.

In line with these principles, researchers from the Geneva Graduate Institute are bound to plan and document research carefully and meticulously and to adhere to the principles of respect, openness and transparency when interacting with members of their research groups, academic peers and the public. Misconduct refers to breaches of ethical

principles and research integrity as outlined in section 3 and 5 of the present guidelines, as well as the *Swiss Academies Code of Conduct for Scientific Integrity* and the *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*.

Misconduct in research includes but is not restricted to:

- **Plagiarism:** using the work and ideas of others without attributing proper credit to the original source
- **Falsification, fabrication or deliberate misinterpretation of research data and findings:** unfair or dishonest manipulation of research materials and procedures; deliberate misinterpretation or omission of research data or results
- **Data theft or abuse of intellectual property:** unauthorized use or copying of primary and other data, research results, or patents generated by or belonging to other investigators
- **Disregard of authorship rules**: claiming authorship without having made a significant scientific contribution to a publication or, conversely, failing to attribute authorship to persons who have made a significant scientific contribution; articulating a sequence of authorship not reflecting adequately each author's contribution
- **Improper handling, management or storage of data:** unauthorised disclosure, transfer, damaging or removal of data or research results; improper pseudonymisation/anonymisation; inadequate or careless storage and transfer of personal or sensitive data
- **Breach of duty of care:** violating the principle of confidentiality; obtaining or disclosing the identity of individuals or groups without their consent; failure to follow established ethics protocols and standards; exposing research participants to unreasonable risk or harm
- **Research obstruction:** harming, delaying or destroying the research of others within or outside one's own research group; deliberately removing, rendering useless or blocking access to research materials and other documents
- **Fraud:** misuse or misappropriation of research funds and their fraudulent reporting
- **Failure to disclose conflicts of interest:** non-disclosure of potential conflicts of interest; allowing funders, sponsors, or other third parties inappropriate influence on research protocols and findings; partial, biased or negligent conduct in peer review or academic assessments
- **Failure to meet regulations and contractual agreements**: breaching relevant agency policies, regulatory or legal requirements; failing to secure relevant approvals, permits or certifications before conducting research activities

The Geneva Graduate Institute treats breaches to scientific integrity according to the procedure outlined in point 7 of the present guidelines. **Harassment or discrimination**, including inappropriate conduct towards fellow researchers, staff, partners or research subjects as well as unfair or prejudiced treatment based on cultural, socio-demographic, or other personal characteristics are treated according to the Geneva Graduate Institute's general Code of Conduct and its implementation directives.

6. Ethics Review Committee (ERC)

The purpose of the Ethics Review Committee of the Geneva Graduate Institute is to assess the ethical issues of projects submitted to it for consideration especially those where ethics approval is requested by external parties.

- The *Ethics Review Committee* is competent in all cases in which research ethics approval is requested by an external funding authority - be it at the project submission stage or later
- The *Ethics Review Committee* is composed of six members as defined below:
  - Research Director (Chair of the Committee)
  - five faculty members, from different departments
- Members are appointed for a period of two years – renewable once – by the Director upon nomination by the Director of Research

- The *Ethics Review Committee* assesses projects and grant applications submitted to external funding bodies (Swiss National Science Foundation [SNSF], Swiss Network for International Studies [SNIS], European Research Council [ERC], etc.). Research projects not falling under this category but a) potentially presenting significant ethical risks or b) requiring ethics approval for journal publications or c) requiring ethics approval for the conduct of field work (i.e. the granting of local ethics approvals) may be referred to the Ethics Review Committee by way of exception. In such cases a preliminary assessment is required from the thesis supervisor (in the case of PhD or Master students) or from the Head of the relevant department or research centre/programme. The preliminary ethics assessment needs to be sent together with the completed *Research Ethics Approval Form* to the *Ethics Review Committee* (researchoffice@graduateinstitute.ch).

- For a project to be considered for review, the completed *Research Ethics Approval Form* must be submitted together with the required attachments to the *Ethics Review Committee* (researchoffice@graduateinstitute.ch) at least four weeks prior to the date when the approval is necessary.

- The *Ethics Review Committee* may:

  - grant approval to research projects submitted for review;
  - seek additional information or ask for revisions before granting approval;
  - withhold its approval.

7. Research Integrity Procedure

7.1 Institutional Responsibility

Academic misconduct occurs in case of one or more violations of the principles of research ethics, academic integrity and good academic practice. Inciting, aiding or abetting academic misconduct as well as attempted academic misconduct equally constitute a violation of integrity. Joint responsibility may, in particular, arise from contributing actively to violations by others, the concealment of misconduct by others and gross disregard of the obligations of supervision.

The Geneva Graduate Institute regards any such misconduct or any breach of regulatory requirements as a very serious matter, which may result in strict disciplinary action.

7.2 Reporting of cases

- Any individual or legal entity may file a denunciation concerning scientific misconduct on the part of a member, or group of members, of the Geneva Graduate Institute community. The denunciation, together with a statement of the grounds on which it is based and all supporting documentation, should be sent to the Director of Research. If the complaint involves the Director of Research, it should be sent to the Director of the Institute who will designate a member of the Academic Direction to act as the substitute for the Director of Research for the purpose of the present procedure.
- Complainants will be required to respect confidentiality and declare any conflict of interest. Anonymous allegations will not be considered.
- If an allegation of research misconduct involving external institutions is filed, the respective institutions will be contacted to determine which institution is best placed to undertake an investigation.

7.3 Admissibility

- The Director of Research or his/her substitute, upon reception of the allegation(s) of research misconduct, assesses any immediate risks and informs key senior management or supervisors.
- The Director of Research or his/her substitute undertakes an initial review of the allegation(s) to establish admissibility following the definition of academic misconduct outlined in sections 3, 5 and 7.1 of the present guidelines. To this purpose, he/she may consult the relevant Head of Department, Head of Research Centre, members of the Ethics Committee or other qualified experts.
- When appropriate, the Director of Research or his/her substitute, together with a member of the Ethics Committee, may conduct a hearing with the Complainant.
- At the end of the screening, the Director of Research or his/her substitute drafts a Memo on the admissibility of the request and undertakes one of the following steps:
  - If the allegation is seemingly unfounded, he/she proposes the dismissal of the complaint to the Ethics Committee.
  - If the infringements and related harm and reputational risk to the parties involved are minor, an amicable settlement may be reached between the parties. Alternatively, the Director of Research or his/her substitute may suggest the Ethics Committee the issuing of a simple warning. Such warnings will be issued by the Director of the Institute.
  - If the denunciation is plausible and receivable, and the gravity of the alleged infringements sufficient, he/she proposes the Research Committee to initiate an investigation procedure.
- The Ethics Committee decides on the admissibility of the complaint based on the recommendations and the documentation provided by the Director of Research.

7.4 Investigative Commission

- The Director of Research or his/her substitute nominates an *ad hoc* Investigative Commission, by designating three or more members from the Geneva Graduate

Institute's Ethics Committee. The Committee comprises at least one member with expertise in the field of the Respondent and appoints a Chair.

- The Director of Research or his/her substitute informs the Respondent of the initiation of an investigation procedure in writing, outlining the nature and substance of the allegation(s) and specifying the composition of the Investigative Commission.
- The Respondent or the Complainant may submit justified written requests for the recusal of specific Commission members due to potential bias or conflicts of interest. The Director of Research or his/her substitute decides on such requests. If a member of the Commission is recused, the Director of Research may designate to the Commission an ad hoc replacement who is not currently a member of the Ethics Committee, in order to ensure the presence of expertise in the field of the Respondent.
- The role of the Investigative Commission is to investigate the allegation(s) of misconduct and establish the facts. The Respondent is given the opportunity to view the files, comment on the accusations, submit evidence or make requests for additional evidence. The Investigative Commission must give the Complainant and the Respondent a proper hearing. It may call witnesses and other relevant parties to appear before it. Witnesses will be subject to confidentiality.
- The Investigative Commission prepares a written report determining whether misconduct has occurred. The report provides a list of the documents reviewed, a presentation of the facts, a summary of the investigative activities and testimonies, and conclusions as to findings of the investigation. It makes recommendations to the Director of Research or his/her substitute on the type and extent of sanctions to be taken.
- The Investigative Committee normally decides by consensus. If consensus cannot be reached, Committee members will vote by show of hands. The Chair has a casting vote.
- The Respondent has the right to review the report of the Investigative Committee and provide written comments before it is forwarded to the Director of Research or his/her substitute.

7.5 Decision and Sanctions

- The Director of Research or his/her substitute reviews the report of the Investigative Committee and proposes the actions that follow from its conclusion.
- The Director of Research or his/her substitute is entitled to hear the parties again, to ask the Investigation Committee to conduct additional investigation or to seek additional advice from external experts.
- The Director of Research or his/her substitute explains the actions s/he will take in a report that is being sent to the members of the Ethics Committee for discussion and validation, ideally by consensus – and in case a consensus is impossible to reach, the Director of Resarch can organize a consultative vote among members of the Ethics Committee. Actions may include one of the following:
  - If the Investigate Committee estimates the accusations to be unfounded, the Director of Research or his/her substitute decides the discontinuation of the procedure.
  - If the Investigative Committee estimates that infringements and related harm and reputational risk are minor, the Director of Research or his/her substitute may suggest an amicable settlement between the parties or the issuing of a warning. If suggesting a mediation, the Director of Research or his/her

substitute proposes the formation of a Mediation Committee composed of the Chair of the Investigative Committee and an additional member of the Ethics Committee who may or may not have been part of the Investigative Committee.

- If the Investigative Committee estimates breach of academic integrity is proven, the Director of Research or his/her substitute decides on the actions to be taken based on the gravity of the facts established by the report, in conformity with the applicable rules, directives and the Code of Conduct of the Geneva Gradaute Institute.

- Upon consultation with the members of the Ethics Committee, the Director of Research or his/her substitute sends the report explaining the actions s/he will take to the Complainant, the Respondent, the Investigation Committee and the Director of the Institute.
- The Complainant and/or Respondent, once informed of the content of the decisions taken by the Director of Research, may revert to an appeal procedure sent to the Director of the Institute in reasonable time (less than 2 weeks after the report is sent by the Director of Research).
    - Acceptable grounds for an appeal with regard to a finding of misconduct and the disciplinary measures are: (i) procedural deficiencies or (ii) an unreasonable sanction. In such cases, the Complainant and/or Respondent will appeal the decision of the Director of Research to the Director in writing.
    - Upon receipt of an appeal, the Director of the Institute will name a Committee of 2 professors who will review the documentation provided by the Director of research, and the grounds for the appeal as expressed in writing by the Appellant. The 2 professors will have 3 weeks to read all material, and issue a recommendation that will be sent to the Director, Director of Research or his/her substitute, and the Investigative Committee.
    - Upon receiving this additional report, the Director of the Institute may then decide to dismiss the appeal or not. The Director of the Institute in any case informs the Respondent, Complainant, Director of research, and members of the Investigative Committee in writing of his or her decision, together with an explanation. The decision of the Director of the Institute is final.
    - The Director of the Institute decides on the time, form, content and the group of addressees, i.e. parties to the proceedings, third parties (e.g. superiors, employees, funding agencies, editors of journals, etc.) or the public.
- If there is no appeal by either the Complainant and/or Respondent against the decision announced by the Director of Research or his/her substitute in his report, then, the Director formally notifies the various parties involved of the decision taken by the Director of research or his/her substitute. All parties are to be informed about the conclusion of the proceedings in an appropriate manner. The Director of the Institute decides on the time, form, content and the group of addressees, i.e. parties to the proceedings, third parties (e.g. superiors, employees, funding agencies, editors of journals, etc.) or the public.

7.6 Procedural principles

- **Confidentiality**: Strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout the procedure and expected from all parties involved. The identity of those involved and information on the allegation(s) will not be released to third parties until the Geneva Graduate Institute is obliged to do so.
- **Conflict of interest**: The parties involved in the procedure must declare any conflict of interest that may arise during the investigation. Complainants or Respondents have the right to highlight any conflict of interest.
- **Presumption of innocence**: Anyone accused of research misconduct is presumed innocent until proven otherwise.
- **Protection of informants**: Throughout the process Complainants and witnesses are protected against retaliation or discrimination, especially if he /she is in a dependent relationship towards the Respondent or if members of the Research Committee are involved.
- **Transparency**: Respondents are provided full details of the allegation(s) and allowed a fair process for responding to allegations and presenting evidence.
- **Sanctions**: Are based on the principles of legality, proportionality and non-discrimination.
- **Appeal**: Complainants and Respondents have the right to appeal the proposed action recommended by the Director of Research to the Director
- **Timeframe:** the procedure will be completed within a time frame appropriate to each individual case but as expeditiously as possible. The Director determines the timeframe at the time of appointing the Investigative Commission.

7.7 Criminal liability

- Scientific misconduct may constitute a breach of relevant legal regulations, e.g. in criminal law and civil law, copyright, patent rights and legislation on environmental protection and trigger lawsuits, public prosecution and sanctions. If, in the case of serious research misconduct the act of committing an offence under federal or cantonal criminal law also comes into consideration, the Geneva Graduate Institute reserves the right to file a complaint to the competent public authorities.

8. Research Ethics Checklist and Additional Resources

Researchers and students of the Institute are encouraged to refer to the *Research Ethics Checklist* in order to self-assess whether their research may be ethically sensitive.

Please find, below, a list of guidelines and codes of practice from which the present code is inspired and may provide further guidance to researchers on ethics related issues:

- **Research Ethics**

  - *American Anthropological Association Ethics Code and Resources*
  - *American Historical Association (AHA): Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct*
  - *British Library: Code of Practice on Research Ethics*
  - *Canadian Government: Panel on Research Ethics*
  - *Code of Ethics of the American Sociological Association (ASA)*

- *Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association (APA)*
- *European Commission: European Textbook on Ethics in Research*
- *Guidelines from the Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth*
- *Oral History Society of the UK Ethical Guidelines*
- *Political Studies Association, Guidelines for Good Professional Conduct*
- *Swiss Ethics*
- *The British Sociological Association: Statement of Ethical Practice*
- *The Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities*
- *US National Science Foundation: The Common Rule for the Protection of Human Subjects*
- *US National Science Foundation: FAQ*

➢ **Research Integrity**

- *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*
- *League of European Research Universities (LERU). Towards a Research Integrity Culture at Universities. Advice Paper.*
- *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and Global Science Forum. Best Practices for Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Preventing Misconduct*
- *Singapore Statement on Research Integrity*
- *Swiss Academies Code of Conduct for Scientific Integrity*
- *UK Academy of Medical Sciences. Perspective on 'Conflict of Interest'*

➢ **Good Referencing**

- *Committee on Publication Ethics COPE. Guidelines*
- *IHEID Libguide on Author's rights*
- *IHEID Libguide on Citing Sources*
- *International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) Guidelines (so-called Vancouver Group)*

➢ **Data Management**

- *Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA) Data Management Expert Guide*
- *Data Management. H2020 Online Manual*
- *DMPtool. Data Management General Guidance*
- *EURODAT. Collaborative Data Infrastructure: Guidelines on data management.*
- *FNS Data Management Guidelines for Researchers*
- *FORS Data Management Guidelines*
- *ICPSR: Guide to social science data preparation and archiving*
- *IHEID Data Management Libguide*
- *IHEID TEMPLATE FOR THE SNSF DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN*
- *Future TDM. Data Management Guidelines for Researchers*
- *RE3dataorg. Registry of Open Data Repositories*
- *UK Data Service: Research Data Management Guide*

- *UNESCO Guidelines for a Data Management Plan*

➢ **International Collaboration**

- *de Grijs R, Ten Simple Rules for Establishing International Research*
- *KFPE's Guidelines for Transboundary Research Partnerships*
- *League of European Research Universities (LERU), Research Collaborations. A guide for Early Career Researchers*
- *Montreal statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations*