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Introduction

Dear Researcher, Supervisor, Teacher, Academic Unit head:

The Faculty of Humanities, along with many other bodies engaged in research in South Africa and more widely, has become increasingly aware over time of the importance and relevance of well defined and properly supported codes, protocols and standards to govern the ethics of research on human subjects.

A great deal of research on human subjects is going on in this Faculty, at every level – undergraduate, graduate and among academic staff. A comprehensive statement on why it is important to apply proper and appropriate standards for such research can be found in the new Faculty Policy on Research on Human Subjects (Appendix A).

This Guidebook has been developed by the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities of 2006 for use by all departments, research institutes, other academic units, research teams or groups, or individual researchers within the Faculty. It applies to the research of both students and staff.

It represents a welcome and necessary step forward in assisting members of the Faculty in understanding why the ethics of research on human subjects is of concern to all of us, more so than ever, and in managing the way we oversee such research. (The Guidebook does not deal with the ethics of research on animals, for which a separate university committee exists.)

The Guidebook has been designed for ease of use by all who need it – and many more people do need it than we sometimes imagine. I trust that it be valued by all who use it, and I thank my committee for their support in generating it. In particular, I wish to acknowledge, with many thanks, the help of Monique Whitaker in producing it.

Sincerely,

James R. Cochrane
Professor
Chair of the Research Ethics Committee
Faculty of Humanities
What does the research ethics policy mean for me?

Whether you are a staff member or graduate student, or an external researcher affiliated with or linked to UCT in any way – you’ll need to get clearance from the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of your department or research grouping in order to pursue any research involving human subjects.

Your planned research should accord with:
   a) UCT’s Code for Research involving Human Subjects (http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/dpa/res-code.htm)
   b) its Statement of Values (http://www.uct.ac.za/uct/policies/uctvalues.pdf)
   c) the University’s various statues and policies (http://www.uct.ac.za/generic.php?m=/uct/policies.php).

What does that involve? It’s quite a simple process:

- Find out the requirements from your department’s REC and submit your proposal.

- If your department doesn’t have a REC, or there is a dispute over their decision on your proposed research, you can take the matter to the Faculty of Humanities REC. For proposal submission requirements contact Sandra Naidoo (Humanities REC Officer):
  ph: 650 2456
  fax: 650 5751
  email: snaidoo@humanities.uct.ac.za

If you’re in any doubt as to what to do, you can use the flowcharts below for easy reference.
How do I get ethical clearance for my research?

To answer this question, follow this procedure:

Are you planning to do research involving human subjects?

Yes: Your research requires ethical clearance.

Does your department or unit have a Research Ethics Committee (REC)?

Yes: You need to contact Sandra Naidoo (Humanities REC Officer), ph: 650 2456, fax: 650 5751, email: snaidoo@humanities.uct.ac.za, to submit details of your proposed research to your departmental REC.

No: Your research does not require ethical clearance (apart from any other specific requirements your department, unit or discipline may have – ask your HOD for details, and see page 26 for links to ethics resources specific to your department or discipline).

No: You need to submit details of your proposed research to the Faculty of Humanities Research Ethics Committee.
What’s needed for submission of a research proposal for ethical clearance?

You’ll need to fill in a standard ethics clearance form (see page 18), as well as whichever of the following are applicable to your particular research project:

- [ ] information sheet
- [ ] consent form
- [ ] copy of the questionnaire to be used
- [ ] details of methods to be applied
- [ ] statement explaining how data or sensitive documents will be safely secured
- [ ] covering letter(s) from relevant institution(s) commissioning the research
What if there’s a problem?

To answer this question, follow this procedure:

Has your proposed research been approved by your departmental REC?

- **YES**
  - No further action is needed – you can proceed with your approved research.

- **NO**
  - Do you want to pursue this further in an effort to get your research approved?
    - **NO**
      - Unfortunately, you won’t be able to pursue your intended line of research. You will need either to reformulate your proposed research or change to a different area of focus entirely, depending on the kind of feedback you received from the REC.
    - **YES**
      - Whether your departmental REC was unable to come to a decision, you simply disagree with their findings or if you wish to dispute the method used to make a decision on your work, you will need to refer the matter to the Faculty REC. For more details Contact Sandra Naidoo (Humanities REC Officer), ph: 650 2456, fax: 650 5751, email: snaidoo@humanities.uct.ac.za.
Contacts

• If you need to know what you need to submit to your department or research grouping’s research ethics committee:

Speak to your departmental administrative assistant or HOD to find out what your department’s particular requirements are.

• If your academic unit (department, institute, etc.) does not have an appropriate committee, or you are not attached to any particular academic unit, and you need to get clearance for research involving human subjects from the Faculty of the Humanities Research Ethics Committee:

Sandra Naidoo (Humanities REC Officer)
ph: 650 2456
fax: 650 5751
email: snaidoo@humanities.uct.ac.za
Authorship guidelines

These guidelines offer researchers some indication of how to handle the sometimes complex questions around authorship.¹

1: Definition of a publication:
A publication is any document produced by a member of staff or student in the Faculty of Humanities, including project reports (and interim project reports), monographs, peer-reviewed articles and electronic media.

2: Authorship and co-authorship:
The Faculty of Humanities defines authorship as substantial participation in a publication. Substantial participation shall mean:
(a) conception and design of the project; or
(b) analysis and interpretation of data; and
(c) drafting or revising the article critically for important intellectual content; and,
(d) final approval of the version to be published.

Where substantial contributions (as defined above) are made by several persons to a common project, they will be joint authors of the product. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. One of more authors should take responsibility for the integrity of the work as while, from inception to published article.

Authors should be able to provide a description of what each contributed. All others who contributed to the work who are not authors should be named in the Acknowledgements, and what they did should be described.

Order of author names on a jointly authored document:
(a) Different levels of contribution: The person who has made the greatest contribution to the paper (often the project leader) is to be listed first with the remaining authors listed in order of their contribution.
(b) The same level of contribution: Normally the person who led the production of the document is listed first. Remaining authors will be listed alphabetically. Where there is no principal author, all names are to be listed

¹ Taken from the University of Cape Town, Faculty of Humanities Proposed Authorship Guidelines, http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/socialanth/dev/ethics/authorship.pdf.
alphabetically, and where all authors are regarded as having made an equivalent contribution, this should be noted in the author credits.

Authorship agreement:
Authorship is a matter that should be discussed between colleagues at an early stage in a project, and reviewed whenever there are changes in participation. The project leader must initiate this discussion. The agreement may be altered by mutual agreement during the course of the project.

3: Student-staff-supervisor co-publication:
The conditions listed in (a) to (d) in clause 2 above apply in the first instance. In the case of a co-authored publication by a student and her/his research supervisor that is substantially based on the student’s dissertation or thesis the student will normally be the first author. This condition may be waived if the student plays little or no role in the preparation of the work for publication. In such an instance, the student will be the second author.

4: Exclusions
(a) Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does not justify authorship.
(b) General supervision or leadership of a research group is not by itself sufficient for authorship.
(c) Mere possession of an institutional position, such as Department Chair, does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to the research or to the writing for publications are appropriately acknowledged.

5: Acknowledgements of contribution to a research project:
It is good practice to acknowledge those who contribute to a publication. The Faculty should follow an inclusive principle of acknowledgement as far as possible. The significance of the contribution of those who are acknowledged should be signalled.

6: Disputes
Disputes concerning any aspects of authorship described above should in the first instance be resolved between the researchers concerned. Where this is not possible, the head of the department or research centre within which the principal researcher or student is based is responsible for arbitration. If this mechanism fails and the departmental research ethics committee is also unable to resolve the dispute, the matter may be referred to the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities for final arbitration.
Case studies

The following are examples of some of the variety of different kinds of problems that can arise in the course of conducting research involving human subjects. These aren’t intended as a guide to what to do in each case, but rather as an indication of the types of issues you might encounter and what potential concerns to consider as you plan and carry out your research.

Deception of research subjects

Attitude change:
Lebogang Makgabo is a social psychologist who wants to study attitude change. She submits a proposal to her institution outlining details of a study that will examine the attitude change of participants following a workshop on environmental issues. Makgabo plans to identify attitude change by administering a pre-test and a post-test.

She is worried, however, that the participants will recognise that she is looking for changes in their attitudes and that this knowledge will influence their answers on the post-test. To address this problem, she plans to disguise the issues she is most interested in; when she administers the tests, she will give a very broad explanation that does not fully disclose the nature of the study. Her proposal includes these procedures and an explanation of why she believes they are necessary; she also includes a plan to debrief the subjects – fully explaining to them the real purpose of the study – after they finish taking the second test.

Conformity:
For a study on conformity to group norms, Brett McCall constructs a survey designed to measure attitudes toward a controversial topic. The research proposal he submits describes his study procedures: He will use as subjects students in a large introductory psychology course he teaches. He includes the following paragraph in his syllabus: “One of the requirements of this course is your participation in a psychology experiment, through which you will be introduced to the methods of psychological research. If you prefer not to

2 The following three examples are taken from the Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science at Case Western Reserve University, Do the Ends Justify the Means? The Ethics of Deception in Social Science Research, http://onlineethics.org/reseth/appo/vol1/justify.html, with minor adaptations.
participate in the experiment, you may instead complete a 50-page research paper on a psychology topic of your choosing.”

He will bring two groups into the laboratory, ostensibly to obtain their attitudes on the survey. One group will be encouraged to discuss their responses freely amongst themselves; the other group, acting as controls, will take the survey independently. In the first group, McCall will ‘plant’ several confederates instructed to advocate loudly one side of the issue in question. From the results of similar studies, McCall believes that the majority of responses given by this experimental group will conform to the position advocated by the confederates, indicating the powerful influence of the group norm. Following the experiment, all subjects will be debriefed as to the true purpose of the experiment.

Altruistic behaviour:
In a research proposal modelling a familiar experimental manipulation to study people’s altruistic behaviour, Renée Leeman plans to place one subject in a room with several experimental confederates. She will assign the group a task, supposedly the purpose of the experiment, then arrange for an ‘emergency’ to occur in the vicinity of the laboratory – the group will hear a loud thud from an adjacent room and then a piercing cry for help.

She will instruct confederates to look up on hearing the cry, then return to their task. In a pilot test, the single subject looked around uncomfortably, then returned to the assigned task, as the confederates did. Following the experiment, subjects will be debriefed about the true purpose of the research.

Issues to consider in the case of deception:
• Would the participants be likely to refuse if they knew beforehand what was being tested for, and, if so, should this mitigate against the research being carried out?
• What risks and harm to participants might arise from each piece of research?
• What are the potential benefits of this research?
• How could the harms and benefits of the research be weighed up against each other?
• Will the proposed debriefings be sufficient to deal with any potential harm to participants?
• Is coercion, suggested by the case on Conformity, acceptable?
Going against research subjects’ wishes

To publish or not:
In his research on the language of a small group living in the United States, Kenneth Mkhize obtained a good deal of ethnographic information as windfall from his intensive linguistic study. Only one ethnography had previously been written about this group; a 1930s master’s thesis, and this work is both difficult to access and incomplete. Because no other major ethnographic work has been done on the group, their culture is generally assumed in the literature to be identical to that of a larger group with whom they were associated in the 18th century. Mkhize found out that this is not so, and that they have (or had, as their culture is rapidly westernising) a distinctive culture, especially in the areas of religion, ritual, and the supernatural.

The dilemma is this: The group does not object to descriptions of their former material culture, but they are strongly opposed to any discussion of their nonmaterial culture. Mkhize was told outright that these beliefs and practices were not the property of outsiders, and that he had been told about them only because he had found out about certain aspects of them, and they did not want him to be in error. He was told that these things should not be published.

Because of the opposition of his research subjects, he did little with his ethnographic notes. At one point Mkhize began to write an article on their culture, but abandoned it because he felt moral qualms about going against the expressed desires of his consultants.

Issues to consider in the case of research subjects’ opposition to publication:
• Do the wishes of research subjects override the value or need for an ethnographic description of a little-known culture that is becoming westernized?
• Would it be ethical to produce a work that would appear only after all of the research subjects are dead – or does the right to privacy, which they on, have to be observed as long as the group maintain their independent existence?
• Would it be acceptable instead to provide only very limited access to the research, when the researcher deemed it important that they be given the correct information?

3 The following example is from the American Anthropological Association, Handbook on Ethical issues in Anthropology, http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/case22.htm, taken from a reader’s letter to the Anthropology Newsletter, with minor adaptations. This is a genuine case, but with a fictional name given to the researcher.
• Are there other potential ways of reaching an accommodation between the group concerned and the researcher that would satisfy both their wishes?

• Should one’s responsibility to one’s discipline always trump one’s personal responsibility to the people one works with, or vice versa?

---

**Reporting on research subjects’ illegal or unethical behaviour**

*What’s in the bottle?*[^4]

The dilemma faced by archaeologist Alexis Andrews was that of alcohol abuse and culturally sanctioned intoxication. She was working in the south west of the United States, and had always refused under all circumstances to make liquor runs for locals, and never brought liquor into an area in which she was working.

While visiting friends in one of the Pueblo villages, however, she frequently saw bootleg deals, drinking, and consumption of substances that are against the law. Andrews was unsure as to whether to report these illegal activities.

*The harmed baby*:[^5]

Halfway through a research project in a newborn Intensive Care Unit, Sarah Michotte, an anthropologist, learned that a premature infant had not been given the state-required test for phenylketonuria (PKU), a pathological condition that can be reversed by diet and medication. Without immediate therapy, cretinism develops.

The ten-weeks’ premature infant weighed only 700 grams and had to be fed intravenously; this may have confused the staff, since the test must be given to a baby who has had approximately six oral feedings. The error was not discovered until two months after the test should have been given and in the meantime the infant had suffered permanent damage. The unit staff as a group “felt bad” about the mistake, but had no-one specific to blame. The house officer in charge of the case initially had finished his training in paediatric intensive care and had been transferred to another department; the nurse in charge had left her job.


[^5]: This example is from the American Anthropological Association, *Handbook on Ethical issues in Anthropology*, [http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/case17.htm](http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/case17.htm), with minor adaptations. The researcher’s real name has been used.
In communicating with the parents, the staff did not make any mention of an error. Instead, the working-class parents, still in their late teens, were told that their baby had a long-term incurable problem. The young parents were enthusiastic about their infant and told the staff, “We’ll love her anyway – God made her.”

Issues to consider when research subjects’ is illegal or unethical:

- Is it more important for researchers to protect a relationship of trust with their research subjects (particularly in cases of long-term research) or to deal with illegal or unethical behaviour?
- Would it be acceptable to report the behaviour anonymously to safeguard the trust between researcher and research subject, while not overlooking illegal or unethical activities?
- In what way exactly are things that are learnt by virtue of a research relationship privileged?
- Certainly there is the appearance of wrongdoing, but has anything illegal or unethical in fact taken place in these cases? Was the trade in alcohol really illegal? Is the baby in as bad a situation as it seems or is the damage actually less serious, or even reversible? To what extent is a researcher obligated to investigate apparently dubious activities in order to establish the true situation?

The limits of informed consent

The Stanford prison experiment:

In 1971, a team of psychologists designed and executed an experiment that used a mock prison setting, with college students role-playing prisoners and guards – which of the two roles they would take on was determined at random – to test the power of the social situation to determine behaviour.

So extreme, swift and unexpected were the transformations of character in many of the participants in this experiment that the study (which had been planned to last two-weeks) had to be terminated by the sixth day. By this time many of those volunteers playing both the prisoners and the guards appeared to have taken on their roles as genuine, for instance with some guards exhibiting unnecessary and

---

6 This description is taken from the American Psychological Association Online: Psychology Matters, Demonstrating the Power of Social Situations via a Simulated Prison Experiment, [http://www.psychologymatters.org/spe.html](http://www.psychologymatters.org/spe.html), with some adaptations.
striking cruelty towards those playing the prisoners and some prisoners accepting this treatment. In fact, many of the participants began to show signs of emotional disturbances.7

Issues to consider around the limits of informed consent:
• Given that all the participants knew that they were participating in a prison simulation research project in which they would play the part of either a prisoner or a guard, and consented to this, does this absolve the researchers of any ethical responsibility for the consequences participants may have suffered as a result of their participation?
• What duty do researchers have to anticipate the possible outcomes of their research and/or the potential consequences for their research subjects, and how far should this extend?
• What constitutes genuine informed consent?
• It is important to note that ‘informed consent’ forms do not cede intellectual copyright and therefore restrict the potential archiving of research materials.

**Useful forms**

The following pages contain two useful forms for your use.

1. The first is the standard form from the Faculty of Humanities for **Ethical Clearance for Research Involving Human Subjects**.

   It is recommended that all researchers use this unless there are reasons for using another form.

   This first form can be photocopied from this Guidebook as is.

2. The second form is a **Sample Consent Form**.

   This form cannot be photocopied as is, and it should be modified to meet the needs of the particular piece of research. This may take the form of creating two rather than one document (see below).

   It is **important to note** that a Consent Form, on its own, is not enough. The information required under the labels *What’s involved, Risks, Benefits, Costs,* and *Payment* has to do with providing the subject(s) of research with clear and unambiguous information about the research and all of its implications for the subject(s). In other words, consent has to be ‘informed consent’.

   It is not unusual for researchers to generate *two* documents to cover these needs:
   - an **Information Sheet** that outlines the nature of the research, what it involves, risks, benefits, costs and payments (even if there is none, this should be stated);
   - and a simple **Consent Form** for signature, which includes an acknowledgement that one has seen the Information Sheet, read it, and understood it.

   - Also see the Centre for Popular Memory’s site for an example of a **Copyright Release Form**:
     [http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm](http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm)
University of Cape Town
Faculty of Humanities

Ethical Clearance for
Research Involving Human Subjects

Section A – Proposal & researcher details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Title of the proposal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Has this protocol been submitted to any other Ethical Review Committee (REC)?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 If so, list which institutions and any reference numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 What was/were the outcome/s of these applications?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Is this proposal is being submitted for ethical clearance for research related to or expanding on research previously approved by the Faculty of Humanities REC?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 If so, what was the previous REC reference number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Researcher Details

4.1 Principal Researcher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Last Name</th>
<th>Department and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 UCT Principal Researcher (If different to 4.1 above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Last Name</th>
<th>Department and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Co-researchers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Last Name</th>
<th>Department and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Last Name</th>
<th>Department and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Last Name</th>
<th>Department and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Is the research being undertaken for a higher degree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 What degree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.2 Student name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3 Supervisor name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 In what department is the degree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Section B – Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Copies</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed research proposal</td>
<td>3 hard copies + electronic copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering letter and all other relevant correspondence</td>
<td>3 hard copies + electronic copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent forms (include translations if indicated)</td>
<td>3 hard copies + electronic copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/s information sheet (if separate from consent form)</td>
<td>3 hard copies + electronic copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval from Head of Department or Research Grouping (signature)</td>
<td>Departmental stamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C – Research information

15. Estimated number of participants:  

16. Estimated duration of study:  

17. Location of study:  

Section D – Financial and Contractual Information

18. Is the study being sponsored or funded?  
   Yes  No  
   
   If yes
   19.1 Who is the sponsor/funder of the study?  
   
   19.2 What is the total budget / sponsorship for the study?  
   
   19.3 Into what fund is the sponsorship being paid?  
   
   19.5 Are there any restrictions or conditions attached to publication and/or presentation of the study results?  
   Yes  No  
   
   19.6 Does the contract specifically recognise the independence of the researchers involved?  
   Yes  No  
   
   (Note that any such restrictions or conditions contained in funding contracts must be made available to the Committee along with the proposal.)
Section E - Statement on Conflict of Interest

The researcher is expected to declare to the Committee the presence of any potential or existing conflict of interest that may potentially pose a threat to the scientific integrity and ethical conduct of any research in the Faculty. The committee will decide whether such conflicts are sufficient as to warrant consideration of their impact on the ethical conduct of the study.

Disclosure of conflict of interest does not imply that a study will be deemed unethical, as the mere existence of a conflict of interest does not mean that a study cannot be conducted ethically. However, failure to declare to the Committee a conflict of interest known to the researcher at the outset of the study will be deemed to be unethical conduct.

Researchers are therefore expected to sign either of the two declarations below.

a) As the Principal Researcher in this study (name:_________________________),
   I hereby declare that I am not aware of any potential conflict of interest which may influence my ethical conduct of this study.

Signature: _____________________________ Date: ________________________

b) As the Principal Researcher in this study (name: _______________________),
   I hereby declare that I am aware of potential conflicts of interest which should be considered by the Committee:

Signature: _____________________________ Date:_________________________

This form can be downloaded from the Graduate School in the Humanities website (under ‘Research Ethics’):
http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/hum/new/ethics.htm
Below is a sample consent form\textsuperscript{8} that you can adapt to suit your particular research project.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Sample Consent Form}
\end{center}

Title of research project:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Names of principal researchers:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Department/research group address:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Telephone:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Email:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Name of participant:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

Nature of the research:

\begin{center}
\hspace{1cm}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{8} Based on the standard consent form of the British Patient database for research and training, www.patsy.ac.uk/www/Consent.doc.
Participant’s involvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s involved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I agree to participate in this research project.
- I have read this consent form and the information it contains and had the opportunity to ask questions about them.
- I agree to my responses being used for education and research on condition my privacy is respected, subject to the following:
  - I understand that my personal details may be included in the research / will be used in aggregate form only, so that I will not be personally identifiable (delete as applicable.)
- I understand that I am under no obligation to take part in this project.
- I understand I have the right to withdraw from this project at any stage.

Signature of Participant / Guardian (if under 18): __________________________

Name of Participant / Guardian: __________________________________________

Signature of person who sought consent: _________________________________

Name of person who sought consent: ___________________________________

Signatures of principal researchers: a)______________________________ (name)

b)______________________________ (name)

c)______________________________ (name)

Date: ______________________________
## Online research ethics resources

All UCT research projects are expected to abide by the UCT Code of Ethics Involving Human Subjects as a minimum standard. The disciplinary codes listed here are guidelines to additional standards that are likely to be appropriate for departments’ research, but depending on the nature of the research and methodology different codes of ethics may apply. It is up to the researcher to ascertain which codes of ethics ought to be consulted as primary guidelines.

### African Gender Institute

*see related departments*

### Centre for African Studies

- **African Studies Association**
  Guidelines of the African Studies Association for Members’ Ethical Conduct in Research and Other Professional Undertakings in Africa:

### Centre for Conflict Resolution

*see related departments*

### School of Dance

- **Australian Dance Council**
  Code of Ethics for Dance Teachers:

- **Royal Academy of Dance Canada**
  Code of Professional Conduct for Teachers of Dance:
  [http://www.radcanada.org/studiodirectory/codeofethics.htm](http://www.radcanada.org/studiodirectory/codeofethics.htm)

### Drama

- **Association for Theatre in Higher Education (American)**
  A Code for Teachers of Theatre in Higher Education:
  [http://www.athe.org/resources/filearchive/ETHICS.html](http://www.athe.org/resources/filearchive/ETHICS.html)
School of Education

- Ethics form to be completed for any research involving human subjects: http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/educate/download/ethicsform.rtf
- British Educational Research Association
- National Education Association (American)
- University of Cape Town School of Education
  Ethics resources for education students: http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/educate/download.php

English Language & Literature

see School of Languages & Literatures

Centre for Film & Media Studies

- Africa Media Ethics
- Ethics in Film
  The Online Journal for Teaching Ethics with Film: http://www.ethicsinfilm.com/DesktopDefault.aspx
- journalism.co.za
- Society of Professional Journalists (American)
  Media Ethics Online: http://www.stlouisspj.org/ethics.htm
- South African National Editors’ Forum

Historical Studies

- American Association for State and Local History
- **American Historical Association**
  Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct:

- **Australian Council of Professional Historians Associations**
  Code of Ethics and Professional Standards:

- **Oral History Society (British)**
  Ethical Guidelines for interviewers and custodians of oral history:

- **Code of Ethics for Historians in Australia**

- **Centre for Popular Memory**
  Research Ethics: [http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm](http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm)
  Copyright and material release forms: [http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm](http://www.popularmemory.org/research2.htm)

- **National Council on Public History (American)**

- **Oral History Association (American)**
  Evaluation Guidelines: [http://www.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html](http://www.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html)

- **Oral History Assistance**
  [http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~ccfriday/tools/OralAssist.htm](http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~ccfriday/tools/OralAssist.htm)
  Additional tools that may be helpful to oral historians are also available at Friday’s site.

- **Reconciliation and Social Justice Library**
  Sharing History: Developing Codes of Ethics

---

**Information & Library Studies**

- **American Library Association**

- **American Society for Information Science**
  A Code of Ethics for Information Scientists:

- **The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**

- **The Library Association (American)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Languages &amp; Literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Modern Languages Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Professional Ethics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_profethics/repview_profethics">http://www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_profethics/repview_profethics</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics (English Languages &amp; Literatures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• British Association for Applied Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.baal.org.uk/about_goodpractice_full.pdf">http://www.baal.org.uk/about_goodpractice_full.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keren Rice, University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issues in Linguistic Fieldwork – An Overview:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/lingfieldwork/pdf/2.pdf">http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/lingfieldwork/pdf/2.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michaelis School of Fine Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Association des illustrateurs et illustratrices du Québec (site in English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College Art Association (American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practices for Artists:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/practices.html">http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/practices.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curators’ Committee (American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forensic Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics for Forensic Artists:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.forensicartist.com/IAI/ethics.html">http://www.forensicartist.com/IAI/ethics.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA College of Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporated Society of Musicians (American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performers &amp; Composers Section Code of Ethics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.ism.org/info/01_3.html">http://www.ism.org/info/01_3.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethical Practices for National and International Auditions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.webcom.com/icsom/miscellany/auditioncode.html">http://www.webcom.com/icsom/miscellany/auditioncode.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The National Association for Music Education (American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Music Code of Ethics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.menc.org/publication/books/ethics.html">http://www.menc.org/publication/books/ethics.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Philosophy

- **American Philosophical Association**  

### Political Studies

- **American Political Science Association**  
  Ethics in Political Science: [https://www.apsanet.org/section_513.cfm](https://www.apsanet.org/section_513.cfm)
- **British International Studies Association**  
  Code of Conduct: [http://www.bisa.ac.uk/code.htm](http://www.bisa.ac.uk/code.htm)

### Psychology

- **American Psychological Association**  
- **British Psychological Society**  
- **The Professional Board for Psychology, Health Professions Council of South Africa**  

### Religious Studies

*see related departments*

### Social Anthropology

- **American Anthropological Association**  
- **American Society for Applied Anthropology**  
  Ethical and Professional Responsibilities: [http://www.sfaa.net/sfaaethic.html](http://www.sfaa.net/sfaaethic.html)
- **Anthropology Southern Africa**  
- **Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth**: [www.theasa.org/ethics.htm](http://www.theasa.org/ethics.htm)
Social Development

- **American National Association of Social Workers**

- **International Federation of Social Workers**

- **South African Council for Social Service Professions**

Sociology

- **American Association of Public Opinion Research**

- **American Sociological Association**

- **Association of Applied and Clinical Sociology**

- **British Sociological Association**
  Statement of Ethical Practice: [http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/63.htm](http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/63.htm)

- **Human Sciences Research Council**
  Code of Research Ethics: [http://www.hsrc.ac.za/about/researchEthics/researchEthics.html](http://www.hsrc.ac.za/about/researchEthics/researchEthics.html)

- **International Sociological Association**
  Code of Ethics: [http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/codeofethics.htm](http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/codeofethics.htm)
  Statutes: [http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/about/isa_statutes.htm](http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/about/isa_statutes.htm)

Research Groupings

- **Institute for Comparative Religion in Southern Africa**
  *see Religious Studies*

- **Centre for Contemporary Islam**
  *see Religious Studies*

- **Centre for Creative Writing**
  *see English Language & Literature*
- Institute for Intercultural and Diversity Studies (iNCUDISA)
  see Political Science, Social Anthropology and Sociology
- The Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research
  see Religious Studies
- Lucy Lloyd Archive Resource & Exhibition Centre (LLAREC)
  see Information & Library Studies
- Centre for Popular Memory
  see Historical Studies
- Research Institute on Christianity and Society in Africa
  see Religious Studies
- Centre for Rhetoric Studies
  see English Language & Literature, School of Language & Literature

**General**

- American Association of University Professors
  Statement on Profession Ethics:
  [http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm](http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm)
- American Statistical Association
  Ethics Guidelines for Statistical Practice:
  [http://www.tcnj.edu/~asaethic/asagui.html](http://www.tcnj.edu/~asaethic/asagui.html)
- Association of American Universities
  Framework for Institutional Policies and Procedures to Deal With Fraud in Research:
  [http://www.aau.edu/reports/FrwkRschFraud.html](http://www.aau.edu/reports/FrwkRschFraud.html)
- Authorship Guidelines, University of Cape Town
- The Belmont Report
  [http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm](http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm)
- Canadian Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics
  Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans:
- The Center for Academic Integrity
- EthicsWeb.ca
  Creating a Code of Ethics for Your Organisation:
  [http://www.ethicsweb.ca/codes/](http://www.ethicsweb.ca/codes/)
- The Social Research Association
  Ethical Guidelines:
  [http://www.the-sra.org.uk/ethical.htm](http://www.the-sra.org.uk/ethical.htm)
• Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, McMaster University
  Ethical Principles in University Teaching:  

• Stanford Human Research Protection Program Policies and Procedures

• United States Department of Health and Human Services
  Office for Human Research Protections: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/
Appendix A:  
Policy on Research Ethics, Faculty of Humanities

Overview and Introduction

Location:
The Research Ethics Committee (henceforth, REC) of the Faculty of Humanities is a sub-committee of the Faculty Research Committee. Its concerns are also represented in the Senate Ethics in Research Committee of the university.

Purpose:
The REC exists to support the efforts of the Faculty to meet appropriate international standards for ethics in research on human subjects. It is tasked specifically to oversee the ethics of research on human subjects carried out by anyone in the Faculty, wherever this occurs (staff, graduate, and undergraduate). Its aim is to assist all researchers in the Faculty to do their research confident in the knowledge that they are meeting best practices in researching human subjects, with respect to methodology, substance, and accountability to those researched.

Activity:
The work of the REC includes:
• policy development and advice,
• responsibility for seeing that all research on human subjects is ethically assessed and cleared prior to its commencement, and
• responsibility for building awareness of ethical issues in the Faculty through education, provision of information and identification of appropriate training programmes.

Mandate:
The mandate of the REC covers all research on human subjects. It has the power to refuse ethical clearance for any particular piece of research, in which case such research should not be carried out until all relevant issues are resolved. It does not include dealing with issues of plagiarism, and it is not a court or tribunal. It does not deal with animal research ethics, for which the university has a separate committee.
**Subsidiarity:**
The method by which the REC addresses the ethics of research in the Faculty of Humanities is governed by the ‘principle of subsidiarity’, as explained below. This places a significant part of the initial responsibility for ethical clearance of research on human subjects in the hands of departments, units and institutes, where the greatest competence to assess research on human subjects normally resides in a faculty with such highly diverse disciplines. Because competence cannot be assumed where research ethics protocols and procedures still remain relatively uneven or undeveloped, the principle of subsidiarity also means that such competence be established and enhanced appropriately as a general policy of the faculty.

What follows describes the context of the ethics of research on human subjects, the current status of research ethics in the Faculty of Humanities, codes and standards, the principle of subsidiarity, proposed department, unit or institute responsibilities, and the constitution of the REC.

**1. The Context of Research Ethics in the Faculty of Humanities**

In the first instance, a concern for the ethics of research carried out on human subjects forms a crucial part of the transformation of the university, as research as a whole takes form in relation to histories of domination, resistance, globalisation and markets. At the same time, following on the key shift that was part of the Nuremberg trials after the Second World War, a concern for research ethics is increasingly a part of the global picture, to the point where any research on human subjects must now demonstrate responsible and accountable methods and procedures.

In addition, many agencies that oversee such research or provide funds for it, more and more require guarantees that all research on human subjects has ethical clearance. Similarly, a growing number of nations are also beginning to regulate research on human subjects, with South Africa likely to follow suit in the near future.

While some of this concern is fuelled by a fear of litigation (the negative ground for establishing proper ethical controls), by far the more significant issues have to do with the rights and well-being of the research subjects themselves and the accompanying responsibilities of the researcher towards them (the positive reason for taking research ethics seriously).
A key issue is the relationship and balance between individual rights and the common good\(^9\) in assessing what is ethically acceptable and what is not. A further issue of importance is the relationship between procedural correctness and substantive concerns for beneficence, respect and justice, as laid out in the Belmont Report.\(^{10}\)

Finally, debate on research ethics ought to be a vibrant component of the UCT’s self-reflection on its scholarly activities. Moreover, a Southern African voice on research ethics needs to find expression: While UCT’s decisions on research ethics may be guided by foreign professional associations, they should take form in relation to local concerns and debates.

### 2. The Current Status of Research Ethics in the Faculty

The broad range of disciplines in the Faculty of Humanities, some of them linked to external professional bodies that have binding and established codes of ethics, some of them generally doing no research on human subjects, means that a fixed common code of ethics is not possible or perhaps even desirable, except at the most general level of principles.

Yet some faculty wide policy on the ethics of research on human subjects is necessary. While appropriate procedures and protocols have been improved over the last years, there is great unevenness across the faculty in their extent, use and quality. In part, this is also a reflection of considerable uncertainty among many staff and students about what is needed and why.

Thus, in 2005, while many Departments reported comprehensively on their research ethics activity and procedures and indicated that Research Ethics were a priority, almost a third of Departments within the faculty failed to report at all, and some Departments that did report offered vague and unhelpful accounts of their procedures and teaching on the subject.

\(^9\) The notion of the common good, the basic presumption of European ethics prior to the Reformation and the rise of ethics based on the individual, with some resonance in classical African ethical positions that emphasize responsibilities to the community, is no longer self-evident, and we do not pretend to resolve the existing debates around just how to define or measure what counts as a common good except to note that it presumes that individual rights do not always trump other kinds of rights or responsibilities.

\(^{10}\) These three latter criteria were established by the *Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research* produced by a USA Congressional Commission in 1979, and since then they have become a widely used international framework for research ethics.
Whatever the reasons for this – which likely include a combination of an overload of administrative tasks, a perception that this constitutes another extension of an audit culture within the University, and a failure to recognise the importance of research ethics – it weakens the credibility and scientific integrity of research within the Faculty, and has an impact on how research funding is viewed or allocated. Equally, it opens up the possibility that those people who are the subjects of research are being compromised.

It is worth noting that the faculty is not alone in this. We may refer to the recent HEQA’s observations (item 14) that decisions on research ethics involving human subjects are not currently pursued evenly across the University. During the interviews that led to this judgement, the Faculty of Humanities was complimented for the moves that have been made to deepen a culture of responsibility for research ethics within the Faculty, and similar appreciation has also come from our own Senate committee. But it was also identified as having some way to go to meet expected standards.

3. Codes and Standards

Codes for ethical research are a crucial part of a university’s intellectual tools, and they are an important resource for guiding researchers in various disciplines and using various research methods. Codes represent the sum of current professional expertise around research ethics, and set standards that are incumbent on good researches.

At the same time, they can never substitute for ongoing personal professional experience, insight, judgement and decision, always required in complex, tricky or controversial instances, when the issues are grey, ambiguous, in need of consideration, requiring consultation, and perhaps in need of new judgements. Such an understanding should underlie any application or use of codes.

The *UCT Code of Ethics Involving Human Subjects* is a minimum standard that ought to be upheld across all Departments in all Faculties.\(^{11}\) Over and above this,

---

\(^{11}\) UCT’s document, *Ethics for Researchers involving Human Subjects: Standards and Procedures*, notes (par. 1): “The University of Cape Town Code for Research Involving Human Subjects should be complemented by further specialist codes for particular disciplines. It is envisaged that in some faculties, for example in the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, more than one specialist code might have to be applied, as there are specific accepted codes for disciplines such as anthropology and psychology. In
within the Faculty of Humanities, many disciplines – especially (but not only) those linked to professional associations – have existing ethical guidelines or codes of conduct to which researchers are accountable.

Each of these codes and/or guidelines requires interpretation in relation to specific contexts. For example, a decision on what constitutes ethical conduct in Film and Media may be grounded in an ethics of exposé, in which the notion of ‘public interest’ may outweigh other concerns. But an ethics of facilitation might be preferred by an anthropologist, for whom potential harm to a research participant is paramount.12

This range of disciplinary and professional concerns presents a very different situation to that of a faculty such as the Health Sciences in which a single policy may be reasonably considered adequate across all of its departments. Moreover, determining which guidelines are appropriate for each research project is not as simple as determining in which department it is undertaken. Many pieces of research cut across disciplines: Ethnographic research may be undertaken in research within Linguistics or Education; researchers in Politics or Sociology may want to archive interviews; a researcher in Religious Studies may focus on material heritage.

The key issue is how the faculty should deal with this situation and context, what approach it should take to research ethics within the Faculty. This has to do with where responsibility resides for processing ethical clearance for research on human subjects and maintaining credible records of what has been decided.

4. Subsidiarity: The Existing Ad Hoc Policy Framework

One way of formulating the issue is to ask: Do Departments want to pass the responsibility for ethical clearance on to a central committee and be subject to that committee’s decisions (if that is even a viable option logistically and operationally)? Or are Departments willing to take responsibility for decisions on research ethics, within the context of faculty-wide accountability?

other faculties, such as the Faculty of Medicine, a single code could be applied.” Source: http://www.uct.ac.za/uct/policies/ethicscode.pdf, May 24 2006

The REC has since 2003 taken the view, generally speaking, that decisions on research ethics are most appropriately made at the level of the department, unit or institute concerned. Its policy, communicated to heads of departments, units and institutes, is based on the principle of subsidiarity. This principle presupposes:

a. That decisions need to be made at the lowest appropriate level at which colleagues are able to make a competent decision, rather than by a centralised structure within a hierarchy; and

b. that referrals upwards should occur only when
   i. there is doubt about a case,
   ii. the relevant decision-maker feels insufficiently competent to make a decision,
   iii. a larger matter or principle is involved that needs wider discussion, or
   iv. the issue is complex enough to require a wider discussion and decision.

The principle of subsidiarity has the further benefit of placing the issue of research ethics in the hands of those who must most directly apply ethical standards and procedures, and who best understand the relevant constraints and requirements of their field. It democratizes the process. Finally, in a faculty burdened by high costs and limited finances with multiple priorities to meet, it is the most cost-effective way of managing what are estimated to be hundreds of pieces of research being carried out on human subjects across a large faculty in any one year.

In practice, this has meant that since 2004, Departments or other academic units have been held to be responsible for assessing the ethics pertaining to research conducted by staff and students, with difficult or complex cases being referred to the REC.

The latter has the advantage of stimulating debate on issues which are vital to effective research. However, if the latter route is chosen, there is a need to propose benchmarks for acceptable participation by Departments and other academic units, and a need for a mechanism for supporting those that need it.

There are important concerns attached to an effective implementation of the principle of subsidiarity:

° In particular, departments, units and institutes who have researchers at any level engaging in research on human subjects need to have in place, or put
in place, their own peer review mechanism for assessing the ethics of such research.

° Second, those who are carrying out such assessment need to be competent to understand what is required in clearing (or not) such research in respect of ethics.

° Third, because it is relatively common within the Faculty of Humanities that researchers are bridging disciplines, it may be necessary to have others from cognate disciplines be part of such assessment and decision-making.

° Finally, attention would have to be paid to the composition of any decision-making body at departmental, unit or institute level in respect of current international standards (which are likely soon to be nationally required standards in South Africa), such as the inclusion of an appropriate gender and racial balance and the presence of an informed lay person on any such body.

5. Subsidiary Departmental Responsibilities

In order for ‘subsidiarity’ to be recognised by the University as a valid, workable and externally defensible means by which the Faculty attends to ethics in its research, some benchmarks of acceptable voluntary participation by Departments and other academic units need to be identified and agreed upon. These include:

5.1 Every department or other academic unit, as appropriate, would be required to establish an internal structure for dealing with research ethics, a representative of which will be nominated as a respondent of the REC.

5.2 The appropriate composition of a committee would be: 13

° A minimum of three academics who have an acquaintance with the ethical requirements of research on human subjects; 14

° One of whom, where practicable, is from a cognate discipline; 15

° Representative membership as far as possible (race, gender, etc.). 16

---

13 What follows is drawn largely from guidelines for Institutional Review Boards that have emerged in recent years, based on widespread experience of identifying ways of dealing with the more difficult aspects of assessing research on human subjects.

14 To allow for sufficient debate and insight and a reasonable consensus.

15 To allow for wider judgements and experience and to facilitate a growing level and depth of expertise within the faculty.

16 To allow for a more sensitive approach to ideological aspects of research on human subjects.
The feasibility of including a lay member at levels below the Faculty REC will be assessed after one year of this policy coming into effect.

5.3 The tasks of the research ethics committee of the academic unit will include:
\(\circ\) perusal of every relevant new project;
\(\circ\) advising on ethical considerations;
\(\circ\) granting approval (ethical clearance) for projects to proceed;
\(\circ\) communicating resultant decisions to the Faculty Research Ethics Committee.

5.4 Academic unit procedures should include:
\(\circ\) a clear statement on the professional codes of research ethics to which student and staff are expected to be accountable, over and above the UCT Code of Ethics on Research Involving Human Subjects;
\(\circ\) a statement of procedure for obtaining ethical clearance from the academic unit;
\(\circ\) teaching on research ethics involving human subjects at a graduate and an undergraduate level;
\(\circ\) and at a graduate or academic unit level, a consideration of debates regarding the interpretation of codes of ethics.

5.5 Accountability to the Faculty for decisions made: Decisions and debates need to be reported on to the REC bi-annually, e.g. March 31 and September 30.

5.6 Where it is not appropriate for a department or other academic unit to have its own research ethics sub-committee or structure – because of the nature of its work does not involve research on human subjects; or because such research is too infrequent or unusual to warrant it – relevant research should be directed toward the Faculty REC for clearance.

5.7 Larger departments or academic units (or cognate groupings of such if this is best), where considerable research on human subjects takes place and solid expertise in research ethics exists, should nominate a competent person to be part of the Faculty Research Ethics Committee, in order to maximize the expertise in the REC and its competence to make relevant and fitting judgements.
6. Communication and education

A key issue in the successful implementation of this policy involves ongoing communication within Departments and other academic units on matters pertaining to research ethics, and within the Faculty REC as such.

6.1 Reporting on all decisions made in the course of each semester on all research projects may be made simpler by providing each Department or academic unit with a simple website template (perhaps set up with the assistance of CHED), accessible only to that unit and the REC.

6.2 Such a template could include:
- a list of current staff and student research projects;
- a brief description of research goals and methods;
- issues highlighted for ethical consideration,
- the name of the person signing off on the decision to approve the project, and
- notes (e.g. of problems arising, or other approval received from elsewhere17).

6.3 A website would also be a useful place to include resources on research ethics, and a forum for discussion within Departments or other academic units.

6.4 Discussion and comparison is needed within the Faculty of key cases and issues. In this regard, an annual interdepartmental and interfaculty seminar on research ethics is proposed (possible themes, for example, include: research involving children; research on HIV/AIDS; the protection of ‘indigenous’ or traditional knowledge; the complexities of research on businesses and livelihoods).

7. Constitution and functions of the REC

7.1 Authority

The REC is a sub-committee of the Faculty Research Committee; it reports in the first place, via the Chair, to the Deputy Dean for Research, who acts on behalf of the Dean.

17 That researchers need ethical approval from more than one body is by no means unusual.
7.2 Membership

7.2.1 The REC should consist of appointees by the Dean, who will endeavour to nominate people as representatively as possible in respect of departments, academic units or cognate groupings, as identified in 5.1 above; together with a chair and deputy chair who shall be appointed by the Dean, either from such identified members or otherwise, with the Chair representing the REC ex officio on the Faculty Research Committee.

7.2.2 The members should represent the broad spread of disciplines or cognate disciplines within the Faculty.

7.2.3 The REC may, where necessary, co-opt additional members from time to time who would offer particular expertise in specific cases.

7.2.4 The REC should be as balanced as possible in terms of gender and racial criteria.

7.2.5 As practicable, a competent lay person from outside the university should be a member of the REC, as an honorary appointment by the Dean.18

7.2.6 The REC should not exceed 12 (twelve) members, and not be less than 6 members.

7.3 Responsibilities of Members

Members of the REC should:

7.3.1 attend all standing and special meetings of the REC as a matter of course;19

7.3.2 contribute to its general work as required;

7.3.3 be tasked with ensuring full participation from the departments or groups they represent;

---

18 To allow for someone without vested interests in the university community to assist in making judgements.
19 Currently four standing meetings per annum (quarterly) are held, but this might need to increase as Faculty activity around research ethics grows.
7.3.4 report on processes and decisions in that Department or other academic unit in order to increase the committee’s general knowledge and understanding of what is happening in the Faculty in respect of research ethics;

7.3.5 report on the inclusion of teaching on research ethics, e.g. in graduate courses.

7.4 Executive Powers of the REC

7.4.1 Where control over ethics procedures and protocols appears inadequate, the REC may nominate a subcommittee of representatives to assist that Department or academic unit in developing a set of procedures. Such a subcommittee would comprise Faculty members whose areas of research are close to that of the academic unit in question.

7.4.2 Where decisions about ethics clearance by departments, academic units or other groupings have been found to be inadequate, the REC would be responsible for reviewing such decisions.

7.4.3 The Senate ethics committee will be regarded as a further resort for problems or difficulties that cannot be resolved internally (e.g. because there is dispute about what is required for a particular piece of research).

7.4.4 Should it become clear that approval has been given for research projects that seem clearly problematic and/or potentially harmful to research subjects or the University, the REC may recommend appropriate action to the Dean, who may instruct the REC to act on the Dean’s behalf (See section 7.5).

7.4.5 The REC will carry out an annual audit of research ethics procedures, practices and decisions in the Faculty, based on reports from departments or other academic units, such audit to be communicated to the Senate Ethics in Research Committee as well.

7.4.6 The REC is responsible for overseeing that relevant Faculty or University wide policies are communicated to all concerned, including providing accessible information on policies that have to do with the ethics of authorship, intellectual property, and inappropriate behaviour (e.g. sexual harassment, unprofessional conduct, in the process of conducting research).

7.4.7 The REC will attempt to assist all those who need it to develop their competence in handling the ethics of research in human subjects, either by
virtue of competence held within it, or by recommending other programmes or avenues. Normally this does not include students per se, who should be receiving this training as part of their degree studies.

7.5 What happens in the case of unethical behaviour?

7.5.1 Any dispute or allegation of misconduct with regard to ethics in research must be dealt with promptly.

7.5.2 Attempts should be made to resolve the matter by reasonable discussion among those involved.

7.5.3 If not resolved, the REC shall act as mediators to investigate and attempt to resolve the matter.

7.5.4 If the matter involves a member of the REC, she or he shall recuse themselves.

7.5.5 If for any reason any party involved in the dispute should object to such mediation, the Dean or her/his nominee shall be informed and shall nominate a senior researcher, who is acceptable to all parties, to act as mediator.

7.5.6 If necessary, the Dean may take other steps to attempt to resolve the matter.

7.6 Administrative Support

Administrative support for the most basic functions of the proposed policy of subsidiarity outlined here should include the following:20

7.6.1 Secretarial service to the REC for its operations, including meetings, seminars and educational events; as a first point of contact in relation to queries from departments, units, institutes and other bodies or persons (e.g. researchers from outside the university); and for document and record keeping.

7.6.2 Support for website management, in particular, updating records, protocols and procedures, and electronic publication of other relevant items.

---

20 Note, were the Faculty to process all ethical issues for research on human subjects through a central committee such as the existing REC, as happens for example in the Faculty of Health Sciences, administrative support and cost implications would necessarily be very substantial.
Appendix B:

UCT Code for Research Involving Human Subjects

http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/dpa/res-code.htm

The University of Cape Town encourages and supports research in a wide range of human sciences. In the exercise of this task it strives for a just distribution and a responsible utilisation of resources and of the benefits of its research in the interests of South African society and the human condition as a whole. This means that the University of Cape Town sets itself the aim of doing research:

i. With scholarly integrity and excellence;
ii. With social sensitivity and responsibility;
iii. With respect for the dignity and self-esteem of the individual and for basic human rights;
iv. With reference to clearly specified standards of conduct and procedures ensuring proper accountability.

In the pursuit of this ideal, UCT subscribes to the interdependent principles of scholarly responsibility, integrity and honesty, of human dignity and of academic freedom and openness. In the context of research, these principles are relevant in the relationships of the researcher to:

i. The research community and its ethos;
ii. Research subjects;
iii. Society as a whole;
iv. The sponsors of research.

Researchers and the Research Community

1. Research should always be carried out in a thoroughly scholarly and responsible manner. Researchers must recognise their responsibility for:
   i. The design, methodology and execution of their research;
   ii. Planning it in such a way that the findings have a high degree of validity;
   iii. Reporting their findings, and their limitations, so that these may be subject to peer review and publicly available; and
iv. Pointing, where relevant, to the possibility of alternative interpretations.

2. The right of fellow researchers to research from a variety of paradigms, and to use a range of methods and techniques should be respected.

3. In the communication of their findings, researchers should adhere to the principles of honesty, clarity, comprehensiveness, accountability and openness to public scrutiny.

4. The authority of professional codes relating to specific disciplines should be recognised and honoured.

5. Researchers must not misuse their positions as researchers for personal gain.

Researchers and Participants (research subjects) in the Research Process

1. In the planning of research, researchers should consider the ethical acceptability and the foreseeable consequences of their research.

2. If conflict arises between the interests of researchers and those of research subjects, the principle holds that the interests of the research subject take precedence.

3. Participation in research requires informed, uncoerced, consent of participants. Researchers should inform participants, in language they can understand, of the aims and implications of the research project and of any other considerations which might reasonably be expected to influence their willingness to participate.

4. Researchers should respect the right of individuals to refuse to participate in research and to withdraw their participation without prejudice to them at any stage.

5. Researchers must protect participants against foreseeable physical, psychological or social harm or suffering which might be experienced in the course of the research. Researchers should be especially sensitive in their protection of the rights and interests of more vulnerable participants, such as children and the aged. When there is risk of harm, discussion of this with participants or their guardians must precede the research and be included in the informed consent procedure. No research should be undertaken on such vulnerable subjects if the required information can be obtained by other means.

6. Information obtained in the course of research which may reveal the identity of a participant is confidential unless the participant agrees to its release.
Researchers and Society as a Whole

The University is committed to conducting research which will contribute to health and quality of life and which strives to serve humanity and South African society as a whole rather than any sectional interests.

The University of Cape Town recognises society’s right of timely access to research findings and to open debate on their implications.

Researchers and the Sponsors of Research

Research which is undertaken on behalf of sponsors is subject to the usual conventions of contract research. Remuneration arrangements for subjects and researchers should be outlined in the contract. Conflicts of interest should be avoided, and all researchers should be asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest. Interference on the part of sponsors which may jeopardise the integrity of the research is not acceptable.

Information which reveals the identity of individual participants in the research will not be supplied to the sponsors other than with the permission of individual research subjects.

In its dealings with the sponsors of research, UCT is committed to upholding the principle that findings should be made responsibly and freely available to the public within a specified and limited timeframe.

UCT is committed to upholding this code, but recognises that as research is a human endeavour it is also dependent on discretionary decisions for which individual researchers must accept ethical and scholarly responsibility. The scholarly and ethical standards of researchers are central to the research endeavour and efforts to sustain and develop these are integral components of research at the University of Cape Town. This code and the more detailed versions available within Medicine21 and other disciplines aim to be more educative than coercive; but minimal procedural standards must also be set.

21 See Medical Research Guidelines on Ethics for Medical Research (SA Medical Research Council, 1993).
Ethical reasoning requires thought, insight and sensitivity. As with scholarly work, peer review is important. In the case of ethics, peer review includes the larger intellectual community, society at large, and research subjects. Seeking ethical approval should be seen as an opportunity for informed ethical reflection and discussion with ethical peers.

In this spirit approval will be required in terms of the principles of this Code of Research, as supplemented by specific disciplinary codes, for:

i. all research projects undertaken by staff and students of the University involving the participation of human subjects;

ii. all research projects undertaken by staff and students of the University being likely to have significant social consequences;

iii. all research projects by researchers external to the university involving the members of the University as subjects;

from the Faculty committees charged with responsibility for research ethics and reporting to the Code of Ethics for Researchers Committee.
Appendix C:
Statement of Values for the University of Cape Town and its Members

http://www.uct.ac.za/uct/policies/uctvalues.pdf

Put forward by Council (6 June 2001)
   Endorsed by IF (26.9.2001)

The University is a community of scholars, teachers, students and staff. A community implies the shared acceptance by its members of common values. The concept of values implies not only rights but also obligations, for the community itself and for its individual members.

The Statement of Values provides a framework that informs and governs what is considered by the University community to be appropriate and acceptable behaviour. The Statement also serves as the foundation for a range of University policies and guides the management of particular aspects of University life.

As a community, the University commits itself, and aspects all its members, to exemplify and uphold these values and to reflect them not only in institutional and personal relationships, but also in all other aspects of University life, including work, sport, recreation, and cultural, intellectual, religious and other activities.

As a value-based community, we aspire to an encompassing ethos which:

- Promotes academic excellence and the attainment of the institutional goal of becoming a world-class African University.
- Preserves what is valuable in the history of the institution and of his country, and responds to the challenges posed by past injustices and unfair discrimination.
- Achieves social transformation, empowerment and participative governance.
- Affirms and protects the fundamental human rights enshrined in the Constitution.
• Encourages the institution and all its members to accept responsibility for the welfare of the community and for behaving in accordance with these community values.

Values

We commit ourselves to:

• Truth, fairness, consistency, and integrity in both academic and other work, and in all personal and institutional relationships.

• Compassion, generosity and concern for the needs and the aspirations of others, and in particular for the changes faced by less privileged in our society.

• Respect and tolerance for cultural, religious, political, and other differences and acknowledgement of the value of diversity in society.

• Respect for individual privacy, dignity, and the right to personal choice.

• Intellectual honesty, vigour in debate, openness to alternate ideas and respect for other views, beliefs and opinions.

• Commitment to high standards, personal fulfillment and the pursuit of excellence.

• The protection and responsible use of the University’s assets and resources.

• Concern for the personal safety, health and welfare of all members of the community.

• The protection and conservation of the environment and natural resources.