

挪威哲学社会科学科研诚信指南

中国社会科学评价研究院
哲学社会科学科研诚信管理办公室
2020年2月 编印

前 言

2019年9月，应挪威北欧创新研究与教育研究所的邀请，中国社会科学评价研究院院长荆林波等一行四人出访挪威，实地走访了挪威北欧创新研究与教育研究所、挪威大学等学术机构，就社会科学评价、科研诚信等主题开展了交流与研讨。各机构对评价院的工作和研究成果给予了高度评价，调研取得了丰富成果，我们通过对挪威有关机构的走访，加深了彼此了解，为进一步加强与欧洲各学术机构的国际合作奠定了基础。

在挪威访问期间，我们与来自挪威教育和研究部、挪威研究理事会、挪威大学国家出版委员会，以及挪威全国人文社会科学研究伦理委员会的多位专家举行了座谈。挪威全国人文社会科学研究伦理委员会专家 Vidar Enebakk 在会上介绍了挪威在科研诚信工作方面取得的成绩和进展，对挪威科研诚信工作各阶段的历史背景和挪威科研伦理机构的概况进行了介绍，并介绍了挪威科研诚信体系建设、相关法规以及研究成果。它山之石可以攻玉，作为此次调研和交流的成果之一，我们希望把调研期间了解到的挪威在科研诚信工作方面的做法译介回国内。

在挪威，国家科研伦理委员会是一个独立的机构，负责各学科领域科研伦理和不当行为的调查，其下设有全国医学与健康科研伦理委员会(NEM)、全国人文社会科学研究伦理委员会(NESH)、

全国科学技术研究伦理委员会（NENT）、国家科研不端行为调查委员会、全国人类遗产科研伦理委员会以及秘书处等部门，其中，全国人文社会科学研究伦理委员会（NESH）成立于1990年，由十二名委员组成，含两名专业代表和十名具有不同专业背景的成员。

NESH的章程规定，除其他事项外，委员会负责制定《社会科学、人文学科、法学和宗教学科研伦理指南》。指南第一版于1993年发布，并分别于1999年、2006年和2016年进行了修订，发布了新的版本。该指南是委员会对具体研究项目进行评估时的主要依据，而在挪威，想要在研究项目中维护科研伦理的研究人员，会主动要求NESH进行项目评估。相应的，自然科学领域的《科学技术研究伦理指南》则由NENT负责制定。

我们把这两份重要指南最新版本中的部分内容，连同由挪威国家研究伦理委员会于2014年制定的《科研伦理的一般准则》翻译成中文，以期体系性地介绍挪威在科研诚信工作方面取得的成绩和有效做法，从而为我国的科研诚信工作提供有益的借鉴。

在编译过程中，中国社会科学评价研究院院务会对编译工作进行了策划和指导，钟慧、赵飞、郭文骞、刘婉莹负责收集资料 and 具体编校工作。由于我们的能力有限，翻译过程中的错漏或不当之处，还请大家批评指正并谅解。

中国社会科学评价研究院
哲学社会科学科研诚信管理办公室

2020年2月

目 录

1. 科研伦理的一般准则	1
2. 社会科学、人文学科、法学和宗教学 科研伦理指南 （节选）	5
3. 科学技术研究伦理指南（节选）	22
4. General guidelines for research ethics.....	28
5. Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Law and Theology（excerpts）	32
6. Guidelines for Research Ethics in Science and Technology （excerpts）	51

科研伦理的一般准则

科研对个人、社会和全球发展都至关重要。在所有这些层面上，科研都发挥了巨大作用。出于这两点原因，科研必须以合乎伦理的方式进行。

原则：

尊重。参与研究的人员，无论是以线人还是其他方式，都应受到尊重。

良好的结果。研究人员应设法确保其活动产生良好的结果，并且任何不良后果均应在可接受范围内。

公平。所有研究项目应公平地设计和实施。

诚信。研究人员应遵守公认的准则，并对同事和公众采取负责任、公开和诚实的行为。

1. 追求真理

科研活动是对新知识的探求，需要进行批判的、系统的验证和同行评审。诚实、开放、系统性和文件化是实现这一目标的基本前提。

2. 学术自由

研究机构应协助确保研究人员在选题、方法、研究实施和成

果发表方面的自由。在委托研究中，委托机构有权与承担委托任务的个人或机构合作，确定课题、研究的问题和范围，但不应试图过度影响对研究方法、研究实施或成果发表的选择。

3. 质量

研究应具有较高的学术质量。研究人员和机构必须具备必要的的能力，设计相关的研究问题，选择适当的研究方法，并确保在数据收集、数据处理和材料的安全保存、存储方面采取合理、适当的行为。

4. 自愿知情同意

征得同意是对个人或与个人相关的信息和材料进行研究时的主要准则。征得同意应该是知情的、明确的、自愿的和可记录的。征得同意的前提是对方有能力表示同意。为了确保自愿的真实性，如果存在参与者与研究者之间有从属关系或者自由受到限制的情况，必须保持警惕。

5. 保密

一般情况下，成为研究对象的人员有权对其个人信息进行保密。研究人员必须防止任何有可能对研究对象造成损害的信息的使用和传播。无论保密责任是怎样的，研究人员都有避免实施应受惩罚的行为的法律义务。研究人员必须决定何时，以及以何种方式，告知参与者在保密义务方面的限制。

6. 公正

公正意味着避免混淆角色和关系，以免引起对利益冲突的合理怀疑。必须保持研究人员与同事、研究参与者、财务来源和其他相关方之间有关角色和关系的公开性。

7. 诚信

研究者对自己研究的可信度负责。捏造、伪造、剽窃以及类似的严重违反学术规范的行为，都与这种诚信不符。

8. 良好的引文规范

研究人员必须遵守良好的引文规范，这些规范必须满足可验证性的要求，并为进一步研究提供基础。

9. 共同协商

研究人员必须互相尊重。他们必须就数据的所有权和共享、作者身份、发表、同行评议和总体合作等方面的规范达成共识并遵守这些规范。

10. 研究机构的责任

遵守科研伦理的责任不仅在研究人员个人，也在研究机构。研究机构负责确保遵守良好的学术规范，并建立机制处理涉嫌违反科研伦理规范案件。

11. 研究结果可公开

一般情况下，研究结果应该公开。公开研究结果对于确保研究结果的可验证性，对于研究参与者和整个社会的获利，以及对于确保与公众对话都至关重要。这种交流也是民主体制的功能之一。

12. 社会责任

研究人员负有独立的责任，确保他们的研究对研究参与者、相关团体或整个社会有益，并防止其造成伤害。研究决策必须考虑到研究领域的发展可能会对个人、动物、社会或环境造成伦理上不可接受的后果。在参与公众讨论时，研究人员必须清楚地区分以专家身份发表的专业意见和以个人身份发表的意见，并避免滥用权威，这是绝对必要的。

13. 全球责任

研究机构和研究人员的有责任将相关知识传播到那些因经济落后而被排除在外的地区。研究应有助于消除全球不公平现象，并保护生物多样性。

14. 法律法规

研究领域内有国家法律和法规以及适用的国际公约和协议的，研究人员和研究机构必须遵守这些法律和法规。

社会科学、人文学科、法学和宗教学 科研伦理指南（节选）

A) 科研活动，社会与伦理道德

1. 科研规范和科研价值

科研人员必须遵守社会公认的科研道德规范。

科学研究是追求创新、改进和更深刻理解的过程。科学研究是由各种具体情况和价值观念支配的，具有系统性和社会性特点的有组织活动。追求真理是科学最基本的义务，然而科学研究永远无法完全实现这一目标。大多数的研究结论只能在特定条件下成立的。尽管如此，规范科研标准本身还是有价值的，其可作为科研社团共同追求真理过程中的指导方针和管理原则。

复杂和理解复杂是人文社会科学研究过程中不可或缺的部分。不同的学术方法和理论立场对同一事物会有不同但合理的解释。因此，更重要的是去沉思和理解个人价值观念、态度是如何影响个人对问题、数据来源和解释的选择。无论科研人员的价值观、所持观念和立场如何，文献的完整性、论证的前后一致性、评价的公正性和对不确定因素的坦诚都是科研伦理道德的常见义务。

2. 科研自由

科研人员和科研组织有责任维护科研的独立和自由，特别是在充满争议的项目（课题）中或战略因素和商业因素对科研活动施加过多压力和约束。

有关原创、公开和信赖的科研规范可能会和其他当事人限制或控制科研活动的欲望相冲突。必须保护科研活动不受来自外部或内部对明确定义问题探索的压力，这些压力错综复杂，可能来自财政、政治、社会、文化或者是宗教利益、宗教传统。这也是为什么在 2007 年为学术自由立法的原因，指令学术组织促进和保护学术自由。^① 不过，*Universities and Colleges Act* 此部法律汇编只有保护科研独立这一条准则，但如今的法律中，教学和科研还必须遵守社会公认的科学准则和道德准则。论证的合理性和相关性，证明材料的质量是研究结论和发展新知识的基础，而不是科研界内外任何已存在的利益、传统。

科研人员和科研组织需要将研究成果公开和发表的职责与义务要求其不得保留或有选择地报告结果和结论。任何强加控制研究结果方向的企图都是非法的。要做出安排以保障科研组织的独立性和组织内科研人员的独立性。科研活动预先设定了追求、生产知识以及向更广泛的公众传播知识的自由。

在基础研究、应用研究和委托研究中，科研独立性的程度有所不同。尽管如此，任何合理和尽责的科研活动都应免受外界压力。此外根据教育和研究部的 *Standard agreement for research and*

^① Section 1-5 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

report (2012)^①中的规定，需指定针对大学和学院外部的委托研究的保护科研诚信的规则。

3. 科研责任

要避免对合格科研活动的控制与约束，而对科研活动的信任要求科研人员和科研组织承担起应负的责任。

科学规范、道德规范和法律规范组成了科研责任。科研活动同样需承担社会责任，是否能成为社会决策的基础工具，成为纠正错误、提供备选方案的关键因素，或者审慎地为公共话语提供基于科研的知识。

科研人员需要为所选项目（课题）、所用方法和分析角度给出正当理由，也需要保证推理结论所依据的证明材料的质量。先入为主的观念、随意的意见对科研活动的影响非常小。在科研群体中形成的一些必要方法论条件，包括系统论证、推理、详实的证明材料以及按照有理有据的批判去修正意见等，提供了一个模式去处理社会其他领域的争端。

科研活动是有价值的，但同样会造成伤害。合格且负责任的科研活动需评估计划外的不良后果。根据科研道德规范的可持续和预防原则，科研人员必须确保研究活动不违反法律法规，不会对人类、社会和自然造成威胁。^②

① The Ministry of Education and Research, 《Standard agreement for research and report assignments》, Oslo 2012. See also the report from the National Research Ethics Committees, *Oppdragsforskning: åpenhet, kvalitet, etterrettelighet*, Oslo 2003 [Commissioned research: transparency, quality, accountability].

② NENT, *Føre-var prinsippet: Mellom forskning og politikk* [The precautionary principle: Between research and politics], NENT publication no. 11, Oslo 1997.

4. 科研机构的责任

科研机构必须保证科研活动的合格且负责，预防科研不端行为，宣传科研道德规范准则。

科研机构要为维持和发展合格的科研活动提供便利。科研机构应向其员工和学生普及科研道德规范，提供科研道德培训和相关法律培训。这有助于引导个人对科研道德规范思考，并促进科研界对科研道德规范和困境的有益讨论。科研机构必须确保其正常地行使了科研道德规范的指导和咨询功能，以保证角色和责任的分工是明确的。在此背景下，科研道德规范指南是制止有害科研活动，确保科研活动合规、负责的重要工具。科研机构应有明确的程序处理对违反科研活动规范的怀疑和指控，例如成立不当行为委员会，负责监督和调查。

D) 科研界

25. 合著作品

科研人员要遵守良好的学术发表惯例，尊重其他研究者的学术贡献，遵守公认的独著和合著标准。

学术发表是确保研究开放和负责任的关键环节。同时，学术发表也带来了各种各样的科研道德挑战和困境。激烈的竞争和巨大的发表压力是科研界的特点，这些特点给公认的科研道德规范带来了压力。例如，原创准则与谦逊准则相矛盾，权威和权力容易使科研偏离诚信和公正的准则。合著作品应与各作者间职责分

配相关。

在原则上，有四条定义合法作者身份的标准。如国际医学杂志编辑委员会（ICMJE）的建议中所述，需满足以下四条标准：

1. 研究者必须对概念、设计或数据采集、数据分析与阐释做出重大贡献；
2. 研究者必须对该著作的学术内容部分的手稿或关键修订做出贡献；
3. 研究者必须同意所发表的最终版本；
4. 研究者必须对整个工作承担责任并对其负责（不必是所有技术细节），除非另有说明。

合作作者应当参与撰写和完成手稿，在人文社会科学中是惯例。只有那些真正在科研和写作中做出贡献的人，才能视为共同作者。换句话说，例如仅仅数据收集、编辑修订和出版许可等此类广义上的贡献是不能视为共同作者的。作品的其他贡献者应当在脚注中注明或结束语（致谢）中感谢他们的贡献。^①

不接受任何形式的名誉作者。只有那些为科研提供了关键智慧的人才享有学术成果的著作权。一般性指导工作、提供资金或者提供数据这些并不符合共同作者资质要求。

应尽可能早的在科研项目中达成协议，尤其是在大型跨学科研究项目中，以确定出版物的共同作者名单和其中的职责分工。

^① www.icmje.org/recommendations/.

26. 引用规范

所有研究人员和学生都必须遵守良好的引用惯例。这是严格检查的先决条件，是进一步研究的重要环节。

研究人员和学生有义务为他们使用的文献提供准确的参考，无论这些文献是主要文献还是次要文献都要明确地标注。当复用自己已出版作品（所谓的“复制”或更误导性地称其为“自我剽窃”）时，需要以恰当的引用标准说明，如在前言中或脚注中。当研究人员和学生从他们的研究之外获取信息时——例如公开文件或互联网——研究人员或学生必须提供准确的参考资料，以便追溯信息来源。参考文献一般需要指明来自那一章节或哪一页，以便读者方便地查找参考，也方便严格检查结论、论证过程以及信息处理方法。

建立和宣传良好的引用规范是科学教学和科研机构共同责任，同时要加强对引用规范的理解，确保使用中的合规性以及及时处理不端案例。研究人员和学生在研究中必须遵守科研诚信，不能弄虚作假。导师有重大的责任跟进学生对科研伦理道德的了解和态度，以便学生在今后的工作中使用良好的引用标准。^①

27. 抄袭

抄袭严重违反了公认的科研道德规范，是不可接受的行为。

抄袭者不仅损毁自己的科研声誉，而且有损科研系统的信誉。

① 《God skikk. Om bruk av litteratur og kilder i allmenne, historiske framstillinger》 [Good practice. About the use of literature and sources in general historical accounts], report commissioned by the Norwegian Publishers' Association, the Norwegian Historical Association and the Norwegian Non-Fiction Writers and Translators Association, Oslo 2006.

防止抄袭现象是全体科研人员和科研机构的共同责任。

在科研伦理中，抄袭是指将他人的研究成果占为己有，且没有合理地注释其来源。抄袭行为违反了遵守科研诚信的义务，违反了对科研独立、谦逊和合作的要求。开展以他人工作为基础的研究时，科研人员必须规范地引用其资料来源。

完全复制是最明显的抄袭行为。除此之外，抄袭还有其它多种形式，例如抄袭作品的思想、假设、概念、理论、解释、设计、插图和结论等等。虽然在一篇的作品中曾规范引用了他人作品，但若在其他部分继续引用同一作品而不标示的话，同样算作抄袭。

需区分脚注、尾注以及正文中的直接引用和转述。转述内容不能与原始文本过于相似，以至于实际上是在引用。如果多条转述是相关的，且整个解释与论证都基于他人作品，则应认定为抄袭。

28. 科研诚信

科研人员和科研机构都必须促进学术研究中规范化。

科研诚信是指在科研实践中需坚持和遵守的优良规范。

不断行为严重违背了在科学实践中追求真理的集体承诺。科研人员有保证信息真实可靠的义务，说谎、隐瞒、歪曲事实等科研不端行为却是在误导其他科研人员。捏造、篡改数据以及剽窃是最严重的科研不端行为。^①在任何类型的研究中以及任何研究阶段都应遵守科研诚信的规定。

^① Section 5 of the Research Ethics Act.

科研机构应将弘扬科研诚信精神、预防科研不端行为的工作落到实处。还要有接收对科研不端行为举报和指控的程序。

综合大学、学院和其他教育机构有责任对学生等科研相关人员普及科研伦理和科研诚信培训教育。这要求良好的引用和科研规范教育需贯穿在学生的整个学术生涯的教学和监管中。知名研究员应在他们的教学和研究中起到良好的榜样作用。

E) 委托研究

34. 科研活动的分类

研究人员和研究机构都必须确保，科研经费和科研团队与开放，可靠和独立的科研规范不冲突。

制订科研政策的首要责任是确保不同类型科研活动之间的平衡，包括不同学科之间、委托研究和科研人员自发研究之间（包括理论研究和应用研究）。科研经费来源差异和科研团队的差异体现在科学和社会的关系上时，出现了不同的科研伦理问题和困境。过去仅限于委托研究的挑战，例如开放性、问责制和独立性等规范性要求，这些挑战如今也出现在其他类型的科研活动之中。

多数科研协会与社会的联系密切。社会资本为科研提供资金支持是为了获得相应的回报。社会资本对科研效用和相关性的期望与科研保持自由独立的规范并不一致，这些矛盾需通过合同条款、所有权、保密协议以及出版权解决。

知识是属于集体的资源，如果科研过于私有化，将会抑制知识的进步和科研对社会的贡献。由外部规则主导的委托研究是社会

会总体知识进步的重要组成部分。因此，委托研究和科研人员自发研究之间应保持合理的平衡。科研赞助商应了解既定的科研组织标准和科研报告标准。^①

35. 委托研究

政府委托科研项目和个人委托项目都有为任务设置指标的合法权力，只要这些指标与其他对研究的约束不冲突即可。但是这些指标并不能免除科研人员和科研机构应承担的责任，这些责任来自与委托人或机构签署的协议。

科研人员和科研机构的科研成果不仅代表自己，也代表了科研界作为可靠知识来源的信誉。委托人有权决定和改变科研的问题和科研方向，但无权妨碍科研人员选择研究方法和基于实验的得出的科研研究成果。科研人员和科研机构都有权利和义务指出研究的不确定性和局限性，例如当研究研究成果将应用于政策决策时。

36. 大型项目中研究人员的责任

参与大型研究项目的科研人员对这些项目负有共同责任。应该明确区分单个研究人员对研究项目的贡献。

在大型科研项目和分级管理的科研项目中，研究人员个体和项目管理之间的管理类似于研究人员/研究机构与委托项目之间的关系。如果研究人员在对机构或项目的忠诚与可被接受的科研伦

^① Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 《Standard agreement for research and report assignments》, Oslo 2012.

理相冲突时，最基本的原则是，每个研究人员要对自己参与的部分负责。研究人员还应承担起揭露违背科研伦理项目的责任。

著作权和发表权必须有明确的协议规定。在委托研究和报告中，委托人、研究机构和研究人员的著作权和发表权也应通过协议明确规定。

37. 学术独立与利益冲突

研究人员和研究机构均应在与他们的领导的关系中保持独立性。

研究人员和研究机构都必须避免来自委托人的制约。这些制约会破坏研究的公正性和研究质量。如果研究人员或研究机构的科研经费只由单一委托赞助，这种制约尤其常见。因此，要保证研究人员/机构和委托人之间没有趋同的利益关系很重要，以保证研究的独立性。（既得利益的威胁）若可将咨询建议服务出售给期待获得特定研究研究成果的参与者，则增加了既得利益威胁。

非经济因素也可能威胁到科研的独立性。人际关系会影响研究的独立性，不管是私人关系还是研究人员（机构）和科研项目参与者之间的长期合作关系。这些人际关系可能会引导研究被用于促进某些政党的观点和利益（典型的政治威胁）；或者不能确保研究人员与参与者之间充足的距离（对保密的威胁）；或者因为参与者有直接影响研究人员的权力地位，从而威胁研究的独立性（压力威胁）。

在某些情况下，研究独立性的作用会和研究人员的其他身份

相冲突，例如指导教师或顾问。如果研究人员接受了可能损害所在机构信任的任务，则必须向组织汇报情况。在某些情况下，这种身份的冲突会非常激烈，以至于并不适合接受该任务。

38. 科研经费公开透明

研究人员和主管人员有义务向公共公开科研经费的来源。

科研经费来源必须清楚透明。经费透明能更好的保护科研人员免受不必要的压力，从而确保研究的自主性和独立性。此外，主管人员有要求科研经费公开透明的合理要求。

研究人员在发布使用科研成果时，有不受约束的义务公开所有的关系（主管人员、科研基金等），这些可能会影响研究报告可信性的关系。

39. 科研成果的陈述报告与利用

研究人员和委托人都有责任防止以误导的方式呈现科研成果。希望得出特别理想的研究成果而去限定研究的主题，或者故意篡改研究成果都是不道德的。

科研管理人员不得以以下方式隐瞒科研成果，委托人不得以公开发表的调查研究成果歪曲一个或多个情况的方式保留研究成果。必须保护研究人员免受委托人指定特定研究结论的不合理要求，在某些情况下，研究人员有退出研究任务的权利。

委托人必须接受研究人员有权在研究报告中讨论其任务授权：例如，指出任务授权中省略了对具有明显专业或实践意义的观点、

解释或考虑。当研究可能对个人或团体的声誉产生影响，或者可能影响政治决策时，对有关原始资料 and 有效推理的要求就特别重要。在这种情况下，研究人员讨论其发现的替代解释或指出科学不确定性尤为重要。如果调查研究成果是由委托人选择性或倾向性地使用的，则研究人员有义务指出这一点，并要求纠正误导性的结论。

40. 出版的权利和义务

知识是一种集体利益，一般而言，所有研究成果都应发布。这对于确保严格检查或重复使用研究成果也很重要。

通常，研究人员有权利和义务发表完整的研究项目摘要和研究成果。这对于防止选择性地或以曲解的方式呈现研究成果，以及给其他人测试研究成果的机会都很重要。

但是，私人公司和政府机构可能有保护自己和利益的合理要求。谈判策略和国家安全都可能要求推迟研究成果的发布，或者在特殊情况下，不应发布研究成果。除此类情况和隐私考虑外，委托人和研究人员应尽力确保公众能够获得研究成果。对发布权的任何限制必须在项目开始时通过合同规定。

F) 科研宣传

41. 宣传是学术责任

研究人员和研究机构有义务将科学知识宣传给研究界以外的广大读者。

研究的宣传涉及将专业研究领域的科学成果，方法和价值传

达给学科以外的人们。宣传可以针对其他学科的研究人员，也可以针对更广泛的受众。可以宣传已成熟的该学科见解，或者是最新的研究成果。

在人文和社会科学领域，科研成果与科研报告的关系尤其紧密，学术出版物通常也是宣传的一种形式。在某些情况下，研究与宣传之间没有清晰的界线，因为知识作为公开辩论的一部分，充当了公众和研究之间的调节剂，公众的意见反过来影响研究的问题和答案。

宣传研究的主要原因之一是要满足公众的知识好奇心。宣传同样对保持民主社会的秩序很重要。宣传应有助于维护和发展文化传统，有助于宣传舆论和宣传与社会有关的知识。社会在研究上投入了大量资金，因此有权分享研究研究成果。

42. 对个人和机构的要求

研究机构必须创造条件广泛地宣传高质量成体系的研究成果。

研究宣传对个人和机构提出了道德要求。大学和大学学院在宣传知识，成果以及科学规范和价值观方面责任重大，既要在学生教学中，也要在公共管理，文化娱乐以及工商业活动中宣传有关的知识。^①学术机构应促进其宣传工作，例如设置相关工作人员、教学或通过经济激励等措施。应鼓励学术机构开展多种方式的教育，例如通过媒体，讲座系列，非学术会议、公开听证会进行不同学科领域的知识共享和辩论。

^① Section 1-1,1-3 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

宣传研究成果还与言论自由和《挪威宪法》第 100 条中的基础设施要求相关：“国家政府应创造条件，以促进公开和开明的公众话语权。”^①此外，学术界也必须为这些公众话语权做出贡献。运行良好的公共行政管理和市场经济的宪政民主制社会是由民间社会的各个领域决定的，这些领域的主要特征不以盈利和管理为原则，而是以辩论为原则。

大学和学院也有责任维护和进一步推广挪威语成为一种学术语言。^②挪威语成为挪威的学术用语对于向公众宣传研究成果很重要。

良好的宣传要求研究机构与其他机构，例如大众传媒，学校，艺术机构，不同信仰的社区和自愿协会之间进行互动与合作。宣传可以在研究人员和其他人员（例如记者和教师）的参与下进行，可以是书面，口头或其他方式（例如展览和电子媒体）。所有参与此类宣传的人都应遵守科研伦理规范。

43. 跨学科演讲与公共协商

各学科专家与公众之间的互动是现代社会中学术宣传的重要方式。

社会面临的许多重大挑战，例如，生态环境、全球化和人权等相关问题，要求跨学科合作以及不同领域的学术知识的整合。因此，非常需要跨学科、面向大众的翻译作品和知识宣传。研究机构建立跨学科论坛为专家的讨论和向大众宣传提供了良好的

^① Article 100 of the Norwegian Constitution.

^② Section 1-7 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

基础。

跨学科演讲是学术辩论文化的基本要求。研究人员必须清晰地表达自己的观点，以使来自其他领域的同事和其他演讲参与者形成对其主张的正确认识。与内部学术讨论一样，不能忽视他人的贡献。

宣传应该清楚，并明确表达学术不确定性和各个学科的局限性。研究人员应该从自己所涉领域的学科和专业知识的角度清楚地表达其局限性，这可能使读者和公众更容易确定其他学科观点是否可能导致其他解释。这样的跨学科和跨机构的讨论可以作为一种扩展的同行评审。

44. 参与公开辩论

研究人员应为公众辩论提供科学依据。研究人员应公正清晰地表达自己的观点，以避免对研究成果曲解性的解释。

当研究人员参加公众辩论时，他们的学术专长是舆论形成的基础。他们可能会在正在辩论的领域提供信息，他们可能会对争议的话题采取合理的立场，或者可能试图将新话题引入公共议程。

研究人员有责任清楚准确地表达自己的意见，以保护自己的研究在政治，文化，社会和经济等领域不被滥用。研究人员还应参与有关合理解释和合理使用研究成果的讨论。其他组织机构，例如公共关系部门，大众媒体，政党，利益组织，企业和行政机构同样有责任保护自己的行为不被曲解与滥用。

研究人员参加公开讨论，对其推理的公正性和明确性提出了很高的要求。以研究人员身份或以公民身份参加公开讨论的界定可能存在灰色地带。研究人员以专家的身份参与时，不仅应陈述自己的学科，还应陈述自己的学历或职位。当研究人员作为公民参加时，他们不应使用自己的头衔或提及特殊的学术专业知识。

45. 学术传播的追责制

对追责制的要求与学术宣传一样严格。

不能期望参与大众化学术演讲的观众能够验证专业研究人员的断言。因此，对学术宣传追责制的要求与学术出版物一样严格。

脚注、尾注和参考文献看似繁琐，但它们可以帮助感兴趣的读者更广泛地浏览相关文献。更重要的，其他学科的专家是读者的一部分。

研究人员可能会在项目进行中与公众分享假设，理论和初步发现，但必须谨慎地将初步研究成果作为最终结论。

46. 向项目参与者报告研究成果

研究人员负有特殊的义务，以一种易于理解和接受的方式将研究成果报告给研究的参与者。

研究参与者有权获得研究回报。这也适用于涉及海量数据的研究。当不可能与每个参与者直接联系时，公开宣传研究成果有助于满足这一要求。

参与者还必须有机会在有必要时能纠正误解。研究过程中研究人员与参与者之间的对话通常有助于研究。研究人员必须告知研究参与者人研究成果，以便以参与者可以理解的方式传达关键发现和见解。

科学技术研究伦理指南（节选）

科研诚信、真实和责任

以下指南是有关如何在科学实践活动中应履行的研究道德伦理：

4. 研究人员有责任保证高质量研究，做到科研诚信、真实和责任担当。研究机构务必为促进高质量研究创造条件。

科研诚信、真实和责任是研究伦理中最基本的要求。研究人员和研究机构有义务去熟悉和遵守与其研究相关的研究伦理。

科研诚信

研究人员有责任去尊重他人的研究成果以及科学实践符合规范。研究人员不得在计划、执行或汇报等研究阶段隐瞒、歪曲和篡改任何事实。抄袭剽窃行为包括将他人研究或思想占为己有。

个人研究者有额外的责任在涉及其个人或他人利益时，保证其科学实践的规范性^①。研究人员在其研究过程中发现或认识到错误时，务必承认错误，纠正错误，确保错误的影响最小化。

规范的引用习惯

研究的本质是在前人的基础上继续研究。研究人员必须坦诚

^① The Act on ethics and integrity in research (the Research Ethics Act) .

地指出其研究中使用的他人发表或未发表观点或研究，只有这样，研究人员各自的科研贡献才是清晰的。研究人员必须全面且符合实情的呈现他人的研究。引文保证了研究的可追溯、可检验。

核实

研究人员和研究机构应在一定时期后为他人核实研究提供数据。如果在此阶段没有使用这些数据，则理应将数据提供给其他研究人员。

在现有的规章制度框架内，研究机构应制定工作指南和程序去保存研究数据，保证数据可被检索查询，及时研究人员完成工作离开此机构也应保证数据的完整。

5. 研究人员必须尊重其他研究人员的学术贡献，遵守学术署名和学术合作规范。

研究人员应规范学术发表行为。研究人员应明确其在团队中的责任以及在合作者中的角色，不接受荣誉作者身份。当数位作者均有贡献时，每位作者身份都应正当合理。根据国际医学杂志编辑委员会（ICMJE）的判别标准^①，符合规范的作者身份有以下四种：**a)** 研究人员必须在构思和设计、数据获取、数据分析和阐释方面做出有价值的贡献；**b)** 研究人员必须在起草手稿或修订出版物的核心部分中有贡献；**c)** 研究人员必须认同出版前的最后版本；**d)** 除另有说明外，研究人员必须为整个作品（不必是所有技术细节）负责。

^① <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>

在跨多学科的出版物中，所有作者必须为其在科研工作中承担的部分负责，同时必须为其他共享者负责的部分负责。

满足标准 a 的作者同时应满足标准 b 和标准 c。不满足所有四条标准的贡献者不应被承认。

6. 当参与到审查他人工作（文章、论文、应用软件、职位等）时，研究人员有责任评估他们自己的资质和公正性。

如果研究人员有任何疑问，研究人员应避免参与评审。

当担任同行评议时，研究人员应遵守如下规则：1) 如果研究人员与作者有严重的冲突，或者与作者有直接合作或竞争关系，则研究人员则应回避；2) 研究人员必须在必要时要勇于承认其专业知识的局限性。

7. 研究人员必须遵守国家与国际有关维护道德和安全的法律法规。

无论是在国内还是在国外，合格的研究惯例需要遵守本国的法律和法规。这也意味着如果道德标准与本国的道德标准不同，那么研究人员应仔细考虑遵守国外立法和法规是否在道德伦理上是否可辩解的。

这意指：

a) 研究人员根据要求申请适当的项目授权；

b) 研究人员遵守国家实验室安全标准并学习和教导他人使用实验设备；

c) 研究人员不能因满足较低的道德或安全标准，而将研究的部分内容在其他国家完成；

d) 研究人员应告知资助机构，在他们从事研究的国家里从事此项研究会违背的所有道德或安全标准规范。

研究与其他知识载体、知识形式的关系

在所有社群中，专业人士和非专业人士都有基于经验的不同知识类型。个人和当地社区可能拥有特定的当地知识。传统知识是另一个有用的类型，国际科学理事会将其定义为“人民与自然环境互动中，维护和发展具有悠久历史的知识，是对专有技术，实践和代表性的累积。土著人民的传统知识就是这种类型，但是在每个社区中都可以找到这种知识。应当给与这类知识及其承载者应有的尊重，保护他们免遭不合理的利用。”

14. 研究人员必须承认其他形式知识的经济和文化价值。

研究人员直接使用或基于其他知识开展研究，有义务承认该知识的经济和文化价值。如果此类研究可带来经济利益，则公平和公正的分享收益应保证有益于传统知识的持有者。通过《名古屋议定书》^①等国际公约，特别有力地防止了对土著民的传统知识不合理的剥削。

^① The following is a link to the Protocol. <https://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf>
<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>

15. 研究人员应与受影响的相关其他知识持有者进行对话。

本地和传统知识都来自于经验。尽管这些知识形式不一定符合科学知识的通常标准，但它们可能是理解特定人群和当地社区的自然、环境和生活条件的重要补充。因此，对于研究人员而言，与这些知识的持有者进行对话非常重要，尤其是在应用研究中，因为这可能会影响当地社会及其生活条件。国际组织特别强调在环境研究中必须尊重和利用土著人民的传统知识。这意味着在应用科学知识或技术时，研究人员应该对利用相关知识持开放态度。

16. 相关受影响各方应参与研究

研究人员必须使用适当的方法来确保受影响的各方都参与其中。

公民民主参与可以纠正研究方向，使研究更有针对性。用户，公民和其他社会角色的参与已出现在一些国际公约中，例如《奥尔胡斯公约》^①。

举报和道德伦理责任

个别研究人员与高级主管人员或主管部门有时可能会发生冲突。当研究人员履行其道德义务充当举报人，又与上级或权威的立场相背时，这种冲突问题更加严重。来自内部的举报一般与研究内部问题有关，比如科研诚信，或者事关重要的社会问题。这种举报通常是自行分析的评估，因此通常是更多未解决问题的导

^① <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>

火索。研究机构必须确保举报人的合法权利不受威胁^①。

19. 当研究人员在工作过程中意识到自己认为与道德原则或社会责任相冲突时，他们必须有机会和责任并根据情况承担举报人的角色。

具体来说，这意味着研究人员必须仔细考虑：

- a) 在组织内部解决冲突的可能性
- b) 应同时考虑举报属实与否对研究者个人、研究机构和社会造成的后果
- c) 不举报的可能后果
- d) 选择对自己可以最大程度减少冲突和最佳弥补伤害的举报渠道
- e) 举报背后的其他可能影响举报人客观性的动机

20. 研究机构必须具有独立的机制，可以在员工举报时为员工提供支持。

重要的是，涉及举报的各方都必须尊重这一事实，即必须以中立的方式处理举报事件。必须由一个独立的集体调查冲突，并且必须保护举报人免遭外界不合理或不合时宜的反应。

这要求：

- a) 研究机构必须建立保护举报人和保护举报事件的机制
- b) 研究机构必须建立机构内部对举报案件的独立审查机制
- c) 研究机构必须确保研究人员都熟悉这些机制

^① Act relating to working environment, working hours and employment protection, etc. (Working Environment Act)

General guidelines for research ethics

Research is of great importance – to individuals, to society and to global development. Research also exercises considerable power at all these levels. For both these reasons, it is essential that research is undertaken in ways that are ethically sound.

PRINCIPLES

- **Respect.** People who participate in research, as informants or otherwise, shall be treated with respect.
- **Good consequences.** Researchers shall seek to ensure that their activities produce good consequences and that any adverse consequences are within the limits of acceptability.
- **Fairness.** All research projects shall be designed and implemented fairly.
- **Integrity.** Researchers shall comply with recognized norms and to behave responsibly, openly and honestly towards their colleagues and the public.

1 Quest for truth. Research activity is a quest for new knowledge, with critical and systematic verification and peer review. Honesty, openness, systematicness and documentation are fundamental preconditions for achieving this goal.

2 Academic freedom. Research institutions shall assist in ensuring the researchers' freedom in their choice of topic and methodology, implementation of research and publication of results. In commissioned

research, the commissioning agency has the right to define the topic, research questions and scope of the research assignment in cooperation with the person or institution undertaking the assignment. The commissioning agency should not seek to unduly influence choice of methodology, implementation or publication.

3 Quality. Research should be of high academic quality. The researcher and institution are required to possess the necessary competence, design relevant research questions, undertake suitable choices of methodology and ensure sound and appropriate project implementation in terms of data collection, data processing and safekeeping/storage of the material.

4 Voluntary informed consent. Consent is the main rule in research on individuals or on information and material that can be linked to individuals. This consent should be informed, explicit, voluntary and documentable. Consent presupposes the capacity to give such consent. To ensure real voluntariness, vigilance must be exercised in cases where the participant is in a dependency relationship to the researcher or in a situation of restricted freedom.

5 Confidentiality. As a general principle, those who are made the subjects of research are entitled to have their personal information treated confidentially. The researcher must prevent any use and communication of information that might inflict damage on individuals who are the subjects of research. Irrespective of the duty of confidentiality, researchers have a legal obligation to avoid punishable offences. The researcher must decide when and in what way the participant should be informed about limitations of the duty of confidentiality.

6 Impartiality. Impartiality means avoidance of confusing roles and relationships in a way that may give rise to reasonable doubt concerning conflicts of interest. Openness regarding relevant roles and relationships that the researcher is involved in must be maintained in relation to colleagues, research participants, sources of finance and other relevant parties.

7 Integrity. The researcher is responsible for the trustworthiness of his or her own research. Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism and similar serious violations of good academic practice are incommensurate with such trustworthiness.

8 Good reference practice. Researchers must adhere to good reference practices, which fulfil requirements for verifiability and form the basis for further research.

9 Collegiality. Researchers must show each other respect. They must agree on and comply with good practices for data ownership and sharing, authorship, publication, peer review and cooperation in general.

10 Institutional responsibility. The responsibility for ethical conduct rests not only with the individual researcher, but also with the research institution. The institution is responsible for ensuring compliance with good academic practice and for establishing mechanisms that can address cases of suspected violations of ethical research norms.

11 Availability of results. As a main rule, research results should be made available. Openness regarding research findings is essential for ensuring verifiability, for returning some benefit to the research participants and

society in general, and for ensuring a dialogue with the public. Such communication is also a function of democracy.

12 Social responsibility. Researchers have an independent responsibility to ensure that their research will be of benefit to research participants, relevant groups or society in general, and for preventing it from causing harm. Research decisions must take into account any knowledge that the development of a research area may entail ethically unacceptable consequences for individuals, animals, society or the environment. It is absolutely essential that when participating in public debate, the researcher clearly distinguishes between professional comments made in his or her capacity as an expert on the one hand and statements of personal opinion on the other, and refrains from abusing his or her authority.

13 Global responsibility. Research institutions and researchers have a responsibility to communicate relevant knowledge to regions that are otherwise excluded for reasons of economic disadvantage. Research should help counteract global injustice and preserve biological diversity.

14 Laws and regulations. In the field of research, there are national laws and regulations as well as applicable international conventions and agreements, and researchers and research institutions must abide by these.

Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Law and Theology

(excerpts)

A) RESEARCH, SOCIETY AND ETHICS

1 Norms and values of research

Researchers are obliged to comply with recognised norms of research ethics. Research is a quest for new and improved or deeper insight. It is a systematic and socially organised activity governed by various specific and values. The most fundamental obligation of science is the pursuit for truth. At the same time, research can never fully achieve this goal. Most conclusions are contingent and limited. Nevertheless, the norms of science have a value in themselves as guidelines and regulatory principles for the research community's collective pursuit for truth.

In the humanities and social sciences, involvement and interpretation are often integral parts of the research process. Different academic approaches and theoretical positions may also allow for different, but nonetheless reasonable, interpretations of the same material. Consequently, it is important to reflect on and account for how one's own values and attitudes affect the choice of topic, data sources and interpretations. Integrity in documentation, consistency in argumentation, impartiality in assessment and openness regarding uncertainty are common obligations in research ethics, irrespective of the values, positions or perspectives of the researchers.

2 Freedom of research

Both researchers and research institutions are responsible for preserving the freedom and independence of research, especially when the topic is controversial or when strategic or commercial considerations impose pressure and constraints on research. Scientific norms regarding originality, openness and trustworthiness may conflict with the desire of other parties to prevent or govern research. Research must be safeguarded against internal or external pressure that limits the exploration of well-defined problems that may intersect financial, political, social, cultural or religious interests and traditions. This is part of the reason why academic freedom was made statutory in 2007, ordering institutions to promote and protect academic freedom.^① However, the independence of research exists as a norm independently of this codification, while at the same time the law now states that teaching and research must comply with recognised scientific and ethical principles.

It is the soundness and relevance of the arguments and the quality of the documentation that should provide the foundation for research based conclusions – and for knowledge production in research in general – not any established interests and traditions in or outside the research community.

The duty and obligation of openness and publication means that neither researchers nor research institutions may withhold or selectively report results and conclusions. Any attempts to impose or dictate what results the research should lead to, are illegitimate. This calls for arrangements to ensure both the independence of institutions and the independence of researchers within the institutions. Research presupposes the freedom to seek, produce and disseminate scientific knowledge to the wider public.

^① Section 1-5 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

The level of independence varies between basic, applied and commissioned research. All research must nonetheless be protected from pressure that endangers good and responsible research. In addition, commissioned research outside the university and university college sector must also have procedures for protecting the integrity of research, as set out in the Ministry of Education and Research's «Standard agreement for research and report assignments» (2012) .^①

3 Responsibility of research

Responsible research requires freedom from control and constraints, while trust in research requires the exercise of responsibility by both researchers and research institutions.

Scientific, ethical and legal norms and values regulate the responsibility of research. Research also has a social responsibility, whether it be instrumental as a foundation for societal decisions, critical as a source of correctives and alternative choices of action, or deliberative as a supplier of research-based knowledge to the public discourse.

Great demands are placed on the justifications of the researchers for their choice of questions, methods and analytical perspectives, and also on the quality of the documentation used to support conclusions, so that preconceived notions and unwitting opinions have minimal influence on the research. The methodological requirements posed by the research community in respect of argumentation, reasoning, documentation and willingness to revise opinions in the light of well-founded criticism may serve as a model for how to deal with disagreement in other segments of

^① The Ministry of Education and Research, «Standard agreement for research and report assignments» , Oslo 2012. See also the report from the National Research Ethics Committees, Oppdragsforskning: åpenhet, kvalitet, etterrettelighet, Oslo 2003 [Commissioned research: transparency, quality, accountability].

society.

Research is valuable, but it can also cause harm. Good and responsible research also includes assessing unintended and undesirable consequences. Researchers must make sure that the research does not violate laws and regulations, or represent a risk to people, society and nature – in accordance with the principles of sustainability and precaution in research ethics.^①

4. Responsibility of institutions

Research institutions must guarantee that research is good and responsible by preventing misconduct and promoting the guidelines for research ethics.

The institutions must facilitate the development and maintenance of good scientific practice. They should communicate the guidelines for research ethics to their employees and students, and also provide training in research ethics and the relevant rules of law that govern research. This would facilitate individual reflection on research ethics and good discussions in the research communities about norms and dilemmas related to research ethics.

The institutions must ensure that they manage the guiding and advisory function of research ethics properly, so that the distribution of roles and responsibilities is clear. In this context, the guidelines for research ethics will be an important tool for preventing undesirable practice and ensuring that research is good and responsible. The institutions should also have clear procedures for handling suspicions and accusations of serious breaches of good scientific practice, for example by establishing

① NENT, Føre-var prinsippet: Mellom forskning og politikk [The precautionary principle: Between research and politics], NENT publication no. 11, Oslo 1997.

misconduct committees with responsibility for oversight and investigation.

D) THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

25 Co-authorship

Researchers must observe good publication practice, respect the contributions of other researchers, and observe recognised standards of authorship and cooperation.

Academic publishing is critical for ensuring that research is open and accountable. At the same time, publishing raises different ethical challenges and dilemmas. The research community is characterised by strong competition and great pressure to publish, which often puts pressure on recognised norms of research ethics. For example, the norm of originality may easily conflict with the norm of humility, and differences in authority and power may easily come into conflict with integrity and impartiality. Co-authorship is also linked to the distribution of responsibilities among different contributors.

In principle, four criteria define rightful authorship. They must all be met, as stated in the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) :

- 1 The researcher must have made a substantial contribution to the conception and design or the data acquisition or the data analysis and interpretation; and
- 2 the researcher must have contributed to drafting the manuscript or critical revision of the intellectual content of the publication; and
- 3 the researcher must have approved the final version before publication; and

4 the researcher must be able to accept responsibility for and be accountable for the work as a whole (albeit not necessarily all technical details) unless otherwise specified.^①

It is common practice in the humanities and social sciences to require that co-authors have actually helped write and complete the manuscript. Only those who have actually contributed to the analysis and writing of a scientific work may be credited as co-authors. In other words, it is not enough to have contributed to the intellectual work with the article in a broad sense, for example a combination of data acquisition, critical revision and approval of the end product. Other contributors must be credited or thanked in footnotes or a closing note (Acknowledgements) . All forms of honorary authorship are unacceptable. Authorship must be limited to persons who have provided significant intellectual input to the research. General guidance, provision of funding or data acquisition do not in themselves qualify for co-authorship.

An agreement must be made as early as possible in the research process, not least in large and interdisciplinary research projects, as to who will be listed as the co-authors of a publication, and how responsibilities and tasks are to be distributed among the authors.

26 Good citation practice

All researchers and students are obliged to follow good citation practice. This is a prerequisite for critical examination and important for enabling further research.

Researchers and students are under an obligation to provide accurate references to the literature they use, whether this is primary or secondary literature. This must be accounted for explicitly, also when

① www.icmje.org/recommendations/.

re-using text from one's own publications (so-called «duplication» or more misleadingly referred to as «self-plagiarism») in the form of proper citation, for example in a preface or in footnotes. When researchers and students obtain information from sources outside their research – such as public documents or the internet – they must provide accurate references that make it possible to trace the information back to the source.

References should usually specify chapters or pages, so that other persons can check the quotes and references. This enables critical examination of assertions and arguments, including of how the sources are used.

Both scientific disciplines and research institutions are responsible for establishing and communicating rules for good citation practice, as well as for creating understanding of these norms, ensuring compliance, and reacting to misconduct. Each researcher or student must conduct their research with integrity, and handle their sources honestly. Supervisors have a special responsibility for following up students' knowledge of and attitudes towards research ethics, so that they may exercise good citation practice in future work.^①

27 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is unacceptable and constitutes a serious breach of recognised norms of research ethics.

A plagiarist undermines not only his or her own reputation as a researcher, but also the credibility of the research. Both researchers and

① «God skikk. Om bruk av litteratur og kilder i allmenne, historiske framstillinger» [Good practice. About the use of literature and sources in general historical accounts], report commissioned by the Norwegian Publishers' Association, the Norwegian Historical Association and the Norwegian Non-Fiction Writers and Translators Association, Oslo 2006.

research institutions are responsible for preventing plagiarism.

Plagiarism in research ethics is taking something from someone else and presenting it as one's own without correctly citing their sources. Plagiarism violates the duty of truthfulness in science, and the requirement of originality, humility and collegiality. Researchers who build on the work of others must cite their sources in accordance with good practice.

The most obvious type of plagiarism is pure duplication. Plagiarism can nonetheless take other forms, for example the use of ideas, hypotheses, concepts, theories, interpretations, designs, illustrations, results etc. Citing another work early in one's own text and then making extensive further use of it without subsequent citation may also be plagiarism.

It is important to distinguish between direct quotes and paraphrasing in footnotes and endnotes as well as in the text. Paraphrasing must not be so close to the original text that it in reality constitutes a quote. If several paraphrases are connected, the entire interpretation and argumentation may be based on the work of others. If so, this may also constitute plagiarism.

28 Scientific integrity

Both researchers and research institutions must promote norms for good scientific practice.

Scientific integrity is about maintaining and complying with good scientific practice.

Misconduct is serious breach of good scientific practice associated with the collective commitment to the pursuit for truth. Researchers have an obligation to truthfulness, and scientific misconduct implies misleading others through lying, concealment or distortion.

The most serious examples of misconduct are fabrication and falsification of data and plagiarism.^① The norm of scientific integrity applies in full to all types of research and in every stage of the research process.

Institutions are required to have routines that promote integrity and prevent misconduct. Institutions must also have procedures for handling suspicions and accusations of scientific misconduct.

E) COMMISSIONED RESEARCH

34 Different types of research

Both researchers and research institutions must ensure that the funding and organisation of research is not in conflict with the norms of open, reliable and independent research.

An overarching responsibility of research policy is to maintain the balance between different types of research, both between different disciplines and between commissioned research and researcher-driven research (pure and applied research) . Different types of funding and organisation give rise to different research ethics issues and dilemmas in the relationship between science and society. Many of the challenges that used to be restricted to commissioned research, relating to norms such as openness, accountability and independence, may be equally relevant today for other types of research as well.

Research communities interact with society in general. When society funds research, it is because it expects something in return. Society's expectations concerning utility and relevance are not irreconcilable with the requirement that research must be free and independent, but this

^① Section 5 of the Research Ethics Act.

places demands on transparency with respect to terms of contract, ownership, confidentiality and the right to publish.

Knowledge is a collective good, and if research becomes too privatised, it will inhibit both the development of knowledge and the contribution of research to society. At the same time, commissioned research, where external principals decide on the subject, are an important part of society's aggregate knowledge development. For that reason, there must be a balance between commissioned research and researcher-driven research. Research funders should be aware of established standards for the organisation of research and reporting assignments.^①

35 Commissioned research

Both public and private commissioners have a legitimate right to set the parameters for research assignments, as long as those parameters does not conflict with the other requirements made with regard to the research. However, that does not exempt researchers and research institutions from their share of the responsibility for the agreements they sign with commissioners.

Researchers and research institutions do not merely report their own results; they also represent the credibility of the research community as a reliable source of knowledge. The commissioner has a right to steer or influence the subject and issues addressed, but not the choice of method, results or conclusions drawn by the researcher on the basis of the results. Both researchers and research institutions have a right and a duty to point out the uncertainties and limitations of the research, for example when the results are to be used in policy decisions.

^① Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 《Standard agreement for research and report assignments》, Oslo 2012.

36 The responsibility of researchers in large projects

Researchers who take part in large research projects have a shared responsibility for those projects. It should be clear how an individual researcher has contributed to a research project.

When research is organised into large, hierarchically managed projects, the relationship between individual researchers and the project management is analogous to the relationship between the researcher/research institution and the commissioner. If researchers experiences a conflict between loyalty to the institution or project and an ethically acceptable approach, the basic principle is that the individual researcher has a responsibility for their own participation. Researchers are also responsible for disclosing circumstances that are not acceptable according to research ethics.

Copyright and the right to publish must be regulated by explicit agreements. This also applies to the relationship between the commissioner, the research institution and the researcher in connection with commissioned research and reports.

37 Independence and conflict of interests

Both researchers and research institutions should maintain their independence in relation to their principals.

Both researchers and research institutions must avoid becoming dependent on their commissioners. Dependence may undermine their impartiality and the scientific quality of the research. This is particularly true if a single commissioner is responsible for a substantial portion of the researcher's or research institution's funding. It is therefore important for the researcher/institution and the commissioner not to have convergent interests to the point that they threaten the

independence of the research (the vested interest threat) . The sale of advisory or consulting services to actors who also have an interest in the research having a particular outcome may increase the vested interest threat.

Non-financial factors may also threaten independent research. Personal ties, either through family relations or as a result of long-term connections between the research institution/researcher and those taking part in the research projects may lead to dependence in several ways. These ties may lead to the research being used to promote the views and interests of certain parties (representative party threat) , or it may lead to there not being sufficient distance between the researcher and the participants (threat to confidentiality) , or it may lead to independence being threatened because the participants are in a position where they can influence the researcher (threat of pressure) .

In some situations, the role of independent research may come into conflict with other roles the researcher may have, for example as adviser or consultant. If a researcher accepts an assignment that may undermine the institution's credibility, it is necessary to report the situation at the very least. In some situations, the conflict between roles will be so strong that the roles should not be combined.

38 Transparency in research funding

Both researchers and commissioners have a duty to make it publicly known who is funding the research.

It must be clear who is funding the research. Transparency concerning funding makes it easier for researchers to protect themselves against undue pressure and thus ensure the freedom and independence of the research. Moreover, commissioners have a reasonable claim to have

their funding of research publicly known.

When researchers are going to publish and use results, they have an independent responsibility to be open and transparent about all ties (commissioners and funding etc.) that might have a bearing on the credibility of the research/reporting that has been conducted.

39 Presentation and use of results

Both researchers and commissioners have a responsibility to prevent research results from being presented in a misleading manner. It is unethical to delimit the subject of the research with a view to producing particularly desirable results, or to present research results in an intentionally skewed manner.

Commissioners may not withhold research results in such a way that the findings that are made public give a distorted picture of one or more circumstances. Researchers must be protected against undue pressure from the commissioner to draw particular conclusions, and in certain situations should invoke their right to withdraw from assignments.

Commissioners must accept that researchers have a right to discuss their mandates as part of research reporting: for example, to point out that perspectives, interpretations or considerations of manifest professional or practical relevance have been omitted from the mandate. The requirements regarding source material and valid reasoning are especially important when research may have consequences for the reputation or integrity of individuals or groups, or when it may affect political decisions. In such cases, it is particularly important for researchers to discuss alternative interpretations of their findings, or to point out scientific uncertainty. If the results are used in a selective or tendentious manner by a commissioner, researchers has an obligation to

point this out, and to demand that the misleading presentation be corrected.

40 Right and duty to publish

Knowledge is a collective good, and as a general rule, all results should be published. This is also important to enable the results to be critically examined or re-used.

Generally, researchers have a right and duty to publish complete descriptions and results of research projects. This may be important both for preventing research results from being presented selectively or in a skewed manner, and for giving others the opportunity to test the results. However, private companies and government agencies may have a legitimate desire to protect themselves and their interests. Both negotiating strategies and the interests of national security may dictate that publication should be postponed or, in special cases, that the results should not be published. With exceptions for such situations and privacy considerations, commissioners and researchers should endeavour to ensure that the public has access to results. Any restrictions on the right to publish must be stipulated by contract at the start of the project.

F) DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH

41 Dissemination as an academic responsibility

Researchers and research institutions are obliged to disseminate scientific knowledge to a broader audience outside the research community.

Dissemination of research involves communicating scientific results,

methods and values from specialised research fields to people outside the disciplines. Dissemination may be aimed at researchers in other disciplines, or at a broader audience. It may be a matter of disseminating established insights into the discipline, or results from more recent research.

The relationship between research and reporting is especially close in the humanities and social sciences, where a scholarly publication often also is a form of dissemination. In some cases there is not even a clear line between research and dissemination, because the knowledge is mediated as part of a public debate which in turn influences the research questions and answers.

One of the main reasons for dissemination of research is to satisfy the intellectual curiosity of the general public. Dissemination is also important for a well-functioning democratic society. Dissemination should contribute to maintaining and developing cultural traditions, to informing public opinion and to the dissemination of knowledge of relevance to society. Society has invested large sums in research, and therefore has a right to share the results.

42 Requirements for individuals and institutions

Research institutions must create conditions for extensive and broad dissemination of research characterised by high quality and relevance.

Research dissemination makes ethical demands on individuals and institutions alike. Universities and university colleges have a special responsibility to disseminate knowledge, results and scientific norms and values, both in their teaching of students and in relation to public administration, cultural life and business and industry.^① Institutions

^① Section 1-1, 1-3 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

should promote dissemination, for example when appointing staff, in teaching, or through financial incentives. Institutions should also encourage dissemination in different arenas and through new kinds of learning, knowledge sharing and discourse, whether it be through the media, lecture series, conferences for non-academics or through public hearings.

Dissemination of research is also associated with freedom of expression and the infrastructure requirement in Article 100 of the Norwegian Constitution: «The authorities of the state shall create conditions that facilitate open and enlightened public discourse.»^① Also the academic communities must contribute to these public discourses. Constitutional democracies with well-functioning public administrations and market economies are contingent on spheres in civil society that are primarily characterised not by principles of profitability and management logic, but by the principle that it is arguments that should count.

Universities and university colleges also have a responsibility to maintain and further develop Norwegian as an academic language.^② A Norwegian academic language is important for disseminating results both to those involved and to the general public and in the public discourse.

Good dissemination calls for interaction and cooperation between research institutions and other institutions such as the mass media, schools, art institutions, communities with various beliefs and voluntary associations. Dissemination may take place with varying participation by researchers and others (such as journalists and teachers), and may be written, verbal or based on other approaches (such as exhibitions and electronic media). All those who take part in such dissemination are subject to the same norms of research ethics.

① Article 100 of the Norwegian Constitution.

② Section 1-7 of the Universities and Colleges Act.

43 Interdisciplinary discourse and public deliberation

An important part of dissemination of research in a modern society emerges from the interaction between specialists in various academic disciplines and the public discourse.

Many of the major challenges facing society related, for example, to ecology, globalisation and human rights, call for interdisciplinary cooperation and the integration of academic knowledge from a number of fields. There is therefore a strong need to translate and communicate knowledge both across different disciplines and to a broader public. The development of multi-disciplinary fora at research institutions provides a good basis both for discourse among specialists and for dissemination to the broader public.

Interdisciplinary discourse can define the basic demands made of a culture of academic discourse. Researchers must express themselves clearly enough for colleagues from other fields and other participants in the discourse to take a reasoned position on their assertions. As in the case of internal academic discussions, renderings of the contributions of others must not be tendentious and persons with other opinions must not have unreasonable views falsely attributed to them.

Dissemination should be clear and plainly express both academic uncertainty and the limitations of individual disciplines. Researchers should express clearly the limitations from the perspective of their own discipline and expertise in the field in question, which may make it easier for readers and the general public to determine whether other disciplinary perspectives could lead to other interpretations. Such interdisciplinary and inter-institutional discussions can serve as a sort of extended peer review.

44 Participation in public debate

Researchers should contribute scientific arguments to the public debate. Researchers should express themselves fairly and clearly in order to avoid tendentious interpretations of research results.

When researchers take part in public debate, they are using academic expertise as a basis for contributions to the formation of public opinion. They may contribute information in an area that is being debated, they may take a reasoned position on controversial topics, or they may seek to introduce new topics onto the public agenda.

Researchers have a responsibility to express themselves clearly and precisely, so that their research cannot be interpreted tendentiously and misused in political, cultural, social and economic contexts. Researchers should also engage in discussions about reasonable interpretations and justifiable use of research results. Other organisations and institutions, such as public relations departments, the mass media, political parties, interest organisations, enterprises and administrative bodies also have a responsibility to conduct themselves reasonably and acceptably in this context.

Participation in public debates places great demands on fairness, reasoning and clarity. There may be grey areas between participation as a researcher and participation as a citizen. Researchers should state their discipline and not only their degree or position, when acting in the capacity of expert. When academics take part as citizens, they should not use their titles or refer to special academic expertise.

45 Accountability in dissemination

The requirement of accountability is equally stringent in dissemination as in publication.

The audience of popularised academic presentations cannot be expected to be able to verify assertions made by specialised researchers. Accordingly, the requirement of accountability is equally stringent in dissemination as in academic publication.

Footnotes/endnotes and reference lists may seem cumbersome, but they can also help the interested reader to navigate through a large body of literature. It is also important to remember that specialists in other disciplines are part of the relevant audience.

Researchers may share hypotheses, theories and preliminary findings with the public in the course of a project, but must be cautious about presenting preliminary results as final conclusions.

46 Reporting results to participants

Researchers have a special obligation to report results back to the participants in a comprehensible and acceptable manner.

Participants in research have a right to receive something in return. This also applies to research where large groups of informants are involved. Dissemination of research may help to meet this requirement when direct contact with each participant is not possible.

Participants must also have the opportunity to correct misunderstandings where this is possible. Dialogue between researchers and participants in the course of the research project may often strengthen the research. Researchers must present the results so that key findings and insights are communicated in a manner that can be understood by the participants.

Guidelines for Research Ethics in Science and Technology (excerpts)

Scientific integrity, truthfulness and accountability

The next guidelines concern the exercise of research ethics through good scientific practice.

4 Researchers are responsible for conducting high-quality research characterised by scientific integrity, truthfulness, and accountability, and research institutions must create conditions that promote such practice.

Scientific integrity, truthfulness, and accountability are fundamental research ethics requirements. Researchers and research institutions have an obligation to familiarise themselves with and observe research ethics guidelines that are relevant to their type of research.

Scientific integrity

Researchers are responsible for respecting the research results of others and for exercising good scientific practice. Researchers must not conceal, misrepresent or falsify anything, whether in the planning, execution or reporting of the research. Plagiarism involves presenting the ideas or research of others as one's own.

The individual researcher has an independent responsibility not to accept

departures from good scientific practice, on his or her own account or that of others.^① Researchers who discover or are made aware of errors in their research, must admit the error, correct it, and ensure that the consequences of the error are minimal.

Good citation practice

It is in the nature of research to build on research by others. Researchers who take advantage of the ideas and research by others, both published and unpublished, must acknowledge this accurately, so that it is clear what the researcher's own contribution is. Researchers must give a balanced and correct presentation of the research of others. Citations make research traceable and verifiable.

Verification

Researchers and research institutions must make data available to others for verification after a certain period. If the data are not used within this period, they should be made available to other researchers.

Within the framework of existing rules and regulations, institutions should have guidelines and procedures for preserving research data, in such a way that they can be retrieved - also after researchers have finished working at the institution.

5 Researchers must respect the contributions of other researchers and observe standards of authorship and cooperation.

Researchers must observe good publication practice. They must clarify individual responsibilities in group work as well as the rules for

^① The Act on ethics and integrity in research (the Research Ethics Act) .

co-authorship. Honorary authorship is unacceptable. When several authors contribute, each authorship must be justified. Justified authorship is defined by four criteria, in accordance with the criteria drawn up by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) ^①:

- a) Researchers must have made a substantial contribution to the conception and design or the data acquisition or the data analysis and interpretation; and
- b) researchers must have contributed to drafting the manuscript or critical revision of the intellectual content of the publication; and
- c) researchers must have approved the final version before publication; and
- d) researchers must be able to accept responsibility for and be accountable for the work as a whole (albeit not necessarily all technical details) unless otherwise specified.

All authors in a multidisciplinary publication must be able to account for the part or parts for which they have been responsible in the research work, and which part or parts are the responsibility of other contributors.

All those who meet criterion a) must be able to meet b) and c) .

Contributors who do not fulfil all the criteria must be acknowledged.

6 When involved in reviewing the work of others (articles, theses, applications, positions, etc.) , researchers have a responsibility to evaluate their own qualifications and impartiality.

If they are in any doubt, researchers should not take part in the review.

When acting as peer reviewers, researchers should abide by the following rules: i) researchers must recuse themselves as reviewers if they have been in a serious conflict with the author in question or if they have a direct cooperative or competitive relationship with the author; ii)

① <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>

researchers must acknowledge the limitations of their expertise where necessary.

7 Researchers must comply with national and international rules and regulations established to safeguard ethical and safety interests.

Good research practice entails observing national laws and rules, both in one's home country and abroad. This also means the researcher should carefully consider whether it is ethically defensible to comply with foreign legislation and regulations, if the ethical standards are different from those in their home country.

This implies that:

- a) researchers apply for the appropriate authorisations for projects where it is required
- b) researchers respect national safety standards imposed on laboratories and learn and teach others to use equipment
- c) researchers do not locate parts of their research in other countries for the purpose of achieving lower ethical or safety standards
- d) researchers inform funding institutions of any non-conformant ethical or safety standards in the countries in which their research is conducted.

The relationship between research and other knowledge-bearers and forms of knowledge

There are a multitude of types of knowledge in all societies. Professionals as well as laypeople have different kinds of experience-based knowledge. Individuals and local communities may

possess specific local knowledge. Traditional knowledge is another useful term, which the International Council for Science defines as a cumulative body of knowledge, know-how, practices, and representations maintained and developed by peoples with extended histories of interaction with the natural environment. The traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples is of this type, but this kind of knowledge is found in every community. These types of knowledge and their bearers should be treated with due respect and at the same time protected against unreasonable exploitation.

14 Researchers must acknowledge the economic and cultural value of other forms of knowledge.

Researchers who directly use or build their research on other kinds of knowledge, have an obligation to acknowledge both the economic and the cultural value of this knowledge. Where such research results in financial gains, a fair and equitable share of the gain should benefit the bearers of the traditional knowledge. The traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples has particularly strong protection against unreasonable exploitation through international conventions such as the Nagoya Protocol.^①

15 Where relevant, researchers should engage in dialogue with other knowledge-bearers.

Local and traditional knowledge arise from experience. Although these forms of knowledge do not necessarily meet the usual standards for scientific knowledge, they may be an important supplement to

^① The following is a link to the Protocol. <https://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf>

understanding the nature, environment, and living conditions of particular populations and local communities. It is therefore important for researchers to enter into a dialogue with the bearers of this knowledge, not least in applied research, which can potentially impact local communities and their living conditions. International organisations have placed particular emphasis on the need to respect and use the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples in environmental research. This implies that when scientific knowledge or technology is applied, researchers should be open to utilising relevant kinds of knowledge.

16 Research should involve the affected parties where relevant.

Researchers must use appropriate methods to ensure that the affected parties are involved. Citizen participation may provide a democratic corrective to choices as to what research should focus on and be aimed at. The participation of users, citizens, and other social actors is laid down in a series of international conventions, including the Aarhus Convention.^①

Whistleblowing and ethical responsibility

On occasion, conflicts may arise between the individual researcher and a senior or an authority. This is particularly problematic when the conflict arises because the researcher regards it as his or her ethical duty to act as a whistleblower, sometimes contrary to the advice of a superior or authority. Instances of whistleblowing may concern internal matters in

① <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>

the research, such as scientific integrity, or they may pertain to matters of societal significance. As whistleblowing of this kind is based on discretionary assessments, it often creates a basis for unresolved conflicts. The institution must ensure that the whistleblower's legal protection is not threatened.^①

19 When, in the course of their work, researchers become aware of matters that they consider to be in conflict with ethical principles or their social responsibility, they must have the possibility and, depending on the circumstances, the duty, to act as whistleblower.

In concrete terms, this means that researchers must consider carefully

- a) the possibilities for resolving the conflict internally in the organisation
- b) the possible consequences of such whistleblowing for the researcher personally, the research institution and society, both if the circumstances reported are correct and if they are not correct
- c) the possible consequences of failing to act as a whistleblower
- d) the whistleblowing channels that best lend themselves to minimise conflict and optimise actions to remedy the damage
- e) possible other motives behind the whistleblowing that may affect the researcher's own objectivity

20 Research institutions must have independent mechanisms that can support employees in whistleblowing situations.

It is important that all parties involved in a whistleblowing situation

^① Act relating to working environment, working hours and employment protection, etc. (Working Environment Act)

respect the fact that the process must be dealt with in a neutral manner. An independent body must investigate the conflict, and the whistleblower must be protected against unreasonable or untimely reactions.

This means that

- a) research institutions must have mechanisms for taking care of both the whistleblower and the subject of the disclosure
- b) research institutions must have mechanisms for conducting such an independent scrutiny of whistleblowing cases in the institution
- c) these mechanisms must be known to the researchers at the institution