

LINCOLN BISHOP UNIVERSITY
Document Administration

Document Title:	Research Ethics Policy
Document Category:	Policy
Version Number:	1.5
Status:	APPROVED
Reason for development:	To update the previous version in light of the institutional name change and to ensure adequate coverage of all processes.
Scope:	This policy applies to all staff and students conducting research.
Author / developer:	Chair of Research Ethics Sub-Committee
Owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Assessment: (where relevant)	Tick relevant assessments: ☒ Equality Assessment ☐ Legal ☐ Information Governance ☒ Academic Governance
Consultation: (where relevant)	☐ Staff Trade Unions via HR ☒ Students via Lincoln Bishop University Students' Union ☐ Any relevant external statutory bodies
Authorised by (Board):	Policy Committee
Date first authorised:	01 March 2017
Date current version authorised	06 November 2025
Date current version effective from:	06 November 2025
Date next review due to commence*:	November 2028
Document location:	University Website
Document dissemination/communications plan	The Research and Knowledge Exchange Centre will launch the policy accompanied by training resources for staff and students. Nominated academic subject representatives will be responsible for ensuring all staff and students in their teams are appropriately informed of the updated policy.
Document control:	All printed versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled. A controlled version is available from the <i>University website</i> .
Alternative Format:	If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact policy@bishopg.ac.uk

*Please note this document remains valid until formally revoked or replaced by the University.

Version Control Table

Version Number	Date Authorised	Summary of Key Changes
1.0	1 March 2017	New Code of Practice
1.5	TBC	To update the previous version in light of regulatory requirements and following extensive review and consultation of all ethics processes.
		To update the previous version in light of changes to the ethics review process, associated documentation supporting this process, and to ensure clarity surrounding links to related policies and processes (e.g. academic misconduct).
		To update the previous version to reflect Lincoln Bishop University's name and vision. To ensure any misconduct concerning artificial intelligence aligns with wider institutional policies and procedures.



Introduction

The aim of this policy is to provide a clear ethical framework for staff and student research at Lincoln Bishop University. The policy raises issues which should be fully considered by researchers, under the guidance of supervisors in the case of student research projects, before undertaking any research activity. It is the duty of the researcher to conduct their research with due consideration to the ethical framework provided by this, as well as any relevant discipline-specific ethical policies and frameworks.

This policy is divided into four sections, and is supported by the associated Procedure for Seeking Research Ethics Approval:

1. Introduction: The underlying principles
2. The responsibilities of researchers and supervisors
3. Respect for the person: Gaining informed consent
4. Respect for the data and the confidentiality of the participants

SECTION A: RESEARCH ETHICS PRINCIPLES

1 Introduction: The underlying principles

- 1.1. The underlying principle of this policy is that research should be conducted with respect for the person(s) and/or institution(s) involved in the research and should be designed, reviewed, undertaken and disseminated in a way that ensures its integrity and quality. This research policy is framed within a commitment to the principles outlined in the Universities UK (2025) Concordat to Support Research Integrity (<https://ukcori.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-2025.pdf>):

Commitment 1: We are committed to maintaining the highest standards of research integrity;

Commitment 2: We are committed to ensuring that these high standard of integrity are governed appropriately, by being transparent with expectations and compliance, including appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards;

Commitment 3: We are committed to embedding a culture of research integrity;

Commitment 4: We are committed to using transparent, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise; and,

Commitment 5: We are committed to working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly, to continue to develop our research practices with accountability.

- 1.2. Research is defined in accordance with the REF 2029 framework: “as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared”¹. Research can additionally refer to student work that may not be “effectively shared”, but may involve the process of collecting new data.

Sensitive research is defined as work that may address difficult areas such as sexual deviance, or that which is conducted with vulnerable groups of respondents such as children. The sensitivity may concern either participants, researchers, users or recipients of the findings, or any combination of these groups.

Furthermore, research may be deemed as sensitive if issues are outlined within section 3.1 or 3.2 of the Research Ethics Clearance Form (see Procedure for Seeking Research Ethics Approval) or the equivalent current version of that form in use. This may concern physical, psychological, emotional and/or socio-cultural risks to participants, researchers and/or users or recipients of the findings.

- 1.3. This Research Ethics Policy serves as a set of guidelines to be followed by members of both the staff and student body at Lincoln Bishop University. This applies to research at all points within a project’s life cycle, including but not limited to that involving data collection from human participants or other sources, teaching which involves data gathering for research purposes, studies requiring the consent of any external organisation or other research setting, as well as the analysis, discussion and dissemination of all ideas, results and products associated with that product. Research includes knowledge exchange activity in the broadest sense, including “contract research” as well as empirical research projects.

¹ <https://2029.ref.ac.uk/>



- 1.4. All collaborative partner institutions should abide by this policy. Students for Lincoln Bishop University awards should follow Lincoln Bishop University arrangements, unless partner institutions have their own policies and procedures, which have been approved by Lincoln Bishop University.
- 1.5. This policy does **not** cover research involving the collection or storage of human material or tissue.
- 1.6. The Research Ethics Sub-Committee is responsible for the application of the University's Research Ethics Policy and supports its implementation through directing, assessing, briefing and training. The Research Ethics Sub-Committee reports to the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee.
- 1.7. Students who fail to follow the University's Research Ethics Policy will be subject to the processes stated in the Code of Practice for Academic Misconduct, the Professional Suitability Policy, the Student Disciplinary Procedure, or another relevant code underpinning subject-specific conduct, as outlined within that code. Students should be offered guidance on research ethics within their disciplines as appropriate.
- 1.8. Staff who fail to follow the University's Research Ethics Policy will be subject to the processes stated in the Disciplinary Policy, Procedure and Guidance. Furthermore, the University may also refer researchers to their professional regulatory body (e.g. the British Psychological Society) if appropriate. Staff should be offered regular guidance on research ethics, for instance via in person training opportunities, clear communication of the research ethics application and review process, and via the sharing of additional relevant codes or practices as they emerge.
- 1.9. The term, "researcher(s)" may refer to an individual, a group of collaborators, a student and/or, where relevant, a supervisor. In all cases supervisors should take responsibility for compliance with this policy by signing to indicate support for a project application. Student researchers are **also** responsible for compliance with the policy, and for conducting their project in accordance with the approved research ethics application.

2. The responsibilities of researchers and supervisors

- 2.1. In planning a study, researchers must carefully evaluate its ethical acceptability and conform to the process of applying for ethical approval which is detailed in The Procedure for Seeking Research Ethics Approval. The process is underpinned by the ethical principles outlined in this policy.
- 2.2. All research should be planned, conducted and disseminated in accordance with the values of integrity, rigour, respect and the principles of open communication and open data.
- 2.3. A primary ethical concern of all researchers lies in considering whether by participating in the research an individual, community or organisation will in any way be at risk of harm as a result of the research. Potential harm includes physical, social, emotional or psychological distress to participants and/or researchers, whether directly or indirectly involved, which might arise in the course of the research and/or its dissemination. Risks can relate to the participants or researcher's social or professional standing, personal values and beliefs as well as deviant or illegal behaviours.



- 2.4. The researcher must take all reasonable steps to protect the participant from any physical and psychological discomfort, harm or danger that may arise from the procedures used. The participant should be informed of any risks in the Research Information Sheet which should also include the procedures for contacting the researcher, within a reasonable time period following participation, in the event of stress, potential harm or related questions/concerns arising from participation in the research. Contact details will normally be included in the Research Information Sheet and, if appropriate, a debrief session maybe included in the research design. Information outlining how to contact an independent person, and/or concerning how to report misconduct, should also be included.
- 2.5. For projects where risk is high the proposal should automatically go to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee for consideration, whether this is for a student or a staff member. Taught student projects should ordinarily be adapted to be low risk, and non-sensitive.
- 2.6. Research which does not involve data collection from human participants should still be considered for potential risks. E.g. findings from secondary data sources about historical figures may impact on living relatives; archaeological digs which bring physical risks to the researchers.
- 2.7. Researchers should develop awareness of potential risks applicable to their study and take steps to minimise them.
- 2.8. Where research is being undertaken involving children or vulnerable adults, the researcher(s) must have the appropriate Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance. The guidelines for DBS clearance laid down by the University should be followed, as appropriate. Where data are collected in collaboration with external participating organisations (e.g. schools, prisons, care homes) their requirements for DBS clearance must be adhered to.
- 2.9. The researcher should take care to ensure that participants are, as far as possible, aware of the period during which their actions or words contribute towards the research findings. Particular care should be taken over the use of data obtained from what might normally be construed as private conversations or actions if the research has not made clear that it is still part of the data collection exercise.
- 2.10. The University is committed to the principles of academic freedom, freedom of speech, and expression. In line with the University's Freedom of Speech policy, research should be undertaken where those involved feel confident and able to research, question and test received wisdom, and to express new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without fear of isolation, marginalisation or discrimination. The University believes that all staff and students should have the right to speak freely, without fear of disciplinary action or any other sanction, provided they do so lawfully, without malice and in the public interest. At the same time, all staff have a responsibility not to abuse this right so as to bring the name of the University into disrepute, for example through any breach of the Research Ethics Policy.
- 2.11. The University has a duty of care to researchers and must take appropriate actions to support those who are undertaking studies of a particularly sensitive nature. All students or staff members who propose to undertake such a study must submit an application for ethical approval to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee for their consideration. If the Research Ethics Sub-Committee approves the proposal, they will create a plan for supporting the researcher in accordance with the appropriate related University policy and procedure, and relevant internal and external colleagues, in order to safeguard those involved in the research.



- 2.12. The University recognises the importance of conducting high quality research and knowledge exchange activity. As such support concerning research ethics training needs will be offered to researchers, in considering additional training or support that may be required to help researchers undertake work to a high standard, for example through the appraisal process and otherwise. Training in research ethics principles and the application and review process will be offered at least twice a year for all staff, and additionally to colleagues with a responsibility for research ethics in their disciplines and teams.
- 2.13. If a student or staff member proposes to undertake research into terrorism or radicalisation, they must submit an application for ethical approval to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee for their consideration. If the Research Ethics Sub-Committee approves the proposal, they will create a plan for supporting the researcher in accordance with the University's Prevent Policy in order to safeguard against radicalization, or association with terrorist or otherwise proscribed organisations.
- 2.14. The researcher always retains the responsibility for ensuring ethical practice in the research and its dissemination. They are also the persons responsible for the ethical treatment of participants by collaborators, assistants, other students and employees. Research collaborators, assistants, students and employees still, however, incur similar ethical obligations to those of the Principal Investigator (PI).
- 2.15. In order to ensure that a project, or programme of research, is reviewed thoroughly and appropriately, additional opportunities for review may be offered throughout the lifecycle of the project.
- 2.16. Human Resources (HR) should ensure that the working conditions and roles of contract research staff should be clear and fair and that any risks are fully explained to them. The Principle Investigator may need to liaise with HR to facilitate this.
- 2.17. Researchers should be careful not to engage in research which they know is beyond their competence. They should have the ability to use the appropriate methodological tools required for the research in question. Considerations of competence need particular attention when entering into contracts with external funding bodies.
- 2.18. In the case of inter-institution collaborative research, and the PI is employed by the University, normal ethical procedures apply and the PI should subsequently investigate whether or not their collaborator's institution also requires ethical approval.
- 2.19. In the case of inter-institution collaborative research, and the PI is employed at another institution, the researcher should lodge a copy of their collaborator's ethical approval with the Research Ethics Sub-Committee. The Research Ethics Sub-Committee shall ensure that no ethical issues for the University arise from the project, by reviewing the collaborative documents and requesting conditions, where relevant.
- 2.20. Those responsible for the research project must ensure some form of compatibility as far as ethical procedures and practices are concerned or reach an agreement as to which institution's ethics policy has precedence. Normally this will be the institution of the PI. Where the PI is employed at another institution, the Collaborating institutions should agree that the project be scrutinised by the Research Ethics Sub-Committee (or equivalent) of the PI's institution and abide by that process and subsequent monitoring. Documentary evidence confirming ethical clearance has been granted must be lodged with the Research and Knowledge Exchange Centre.



- 2.21. When designing a research project that involves overseas collaboration and/or data collection, the researcher must take into account different circumstances in the countries involved, particularly different ethical standards, political and cultural considerations, handling and storage of personal data, the relationship between researcher and participant, access to research resources and the rules that exist within the country with regard to conducting research. While recognising the contextual setting every effort should be made to ensure data collected overseas meets the ethical guidance contained in this and any appropriate discipline-specific ethical guidance (e.g. BERA, BPS, BSA and the SRA). Data should, wherever possible, be stored and transferred only within the European Union, as per current General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) guidelines (<https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/>). In cases where this may not be possible, details should be outlined within the ethics application.
- 2.22. Researchers must be aware of any potential conflicts of interest in their work arising from their position within the research context, e.g. insider research. In particular, researchers in a position of authority arising from or separate from the research process should beware of placing other participants in a situation where they feel obliged to participate in the research or to produce particular results.
- 2.23. Researchers must beware of undertaking research in an area where they may be perceived to have a conflict of interest, for example in the form of a commercial or professional benefit accruing from particular results. Such instances should be declared and referred to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee.
- 2.24. Due credit should be given to the contribution made by all of the researchers involved in a project. Authorship should be credited to those who had a substantive input into the research output in question, with the appropriate relative weighting being accorded to authors. For example, this should be in terms of the order of authorship, irrespective of professional position or seniority. Ideally, this should be agreed between those involved in the research before outputs are compiled. It is deemed unethical to list, as an author, a person who has not made a substantial contribution to the output. Where a minor contribution has been made, the contributor should be listed in the acknowledgments section of the output, as per publisher's guidelines.
- 2.25. In accordance with the University's Intellectual Property Policy, the Intellectual Property (IP) of research by students, created as part of their studies, is owned by the student subject to the existence of any prior agreement to the contrary. Where students and/or staff members collaborate to produce research, the attribution of rights and ownership must be equitable and should ideally be agreed prior to work commencing, or as early on in the process of creation as possible. The University automatically grants copyright to staff members as individual and joint authors of research. The authors are thus entitled to transfer copyright to organisations who accept their works for publication. Staff who undertake collaborative research or who engage in commercial research should discuss and agree intellectual property rights early on, and in particular prior to the signing of any contract.
- 2.26. All research must be undertaken strictly in accordance with Lincoln Bishop University's current Diversity and Equality policies. No group should be *unreasonably* excluded from the research. Research should be commissioned, designed and undertaken in such a way as to respect the interests of all social groups whatever their age, disability, race, ethnicity, religion, culture, gender or other characteristics. However, some research will focus on a specific group and it would be inappropriate to seek wider levels of inclusiveness across social groups in such research.



- 2.27. Where ethical clearance has been granted, but circumstances require a significant change to the research design, ethical clearance must be reapplied for. Where minor amendments are required, applicants need to notify the Research and Knowledge Exchange Centre so a record of the amendment can be kept.
- 2.28. Researchers working with, for, or under the auspices of, any of the UK Departments of Health and/or the National Health Service must adhere to all relevant guidelines and apply for external ethical approval. Copies of all external approvals from the NHS must be lodged with Lincoln Bishop University's Research Ethics Sub-Committee. The same applies to comparable Departments, such as the MoD.
- 2.29. Researchers working with any external institutions must lodge copies of ethical approval from those institutions with Lincoln Bishop University's Research Ethics Sub-Committee. As a general principle, the more wide-ranging the research, the higher the level of consent required (for example, Local Authority consent in the case of a survey across all the schools in an area). The researcher should check for any conflicts between relevant policies of the institution in which the research is being done and the intended research. It is the researcher's responsibility to resolve any problems and, if necessary, refer the issue to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee. If the Principle Investigator is from Lincoln Bishop University, any NHS/IRAS application will require sponsorship from Lincoln Bishop University.
- 2.30. Researchers who are members of professional bodies (e.g. BERA, BPS) must also abide by the body's guidance and, where appropriate, regulations.
- 2.31. Staff research which is text-based and does not involve data collection from human participants may need ethical approval if required by a funding body or other external organisation, and/or if it is sensitive in nature. All researchers who are undertaking text-based research must abide by the ethical principles relating to relevant matters in this policy e.g. copyright, data storage and dissemination, and carefully consider any potential ethical repercussions arising from findings which may impact on people or organisations.
- 2.32. Retrospective ethical approval will not be granted where researchers have intentionally collected data from human participants without abiding by this policy.
- 2.33. Internet-mediated research, which may include employing online modes of recruitment, accessing, analysing and/or storing data online, and collecting data via online tools, should ensure that informed consent has been sought via online means, as appropriate.
- 2.34. Voluntary participation should be promoted, and not undermined in any case. Participants should be informed of their right to withdraw without penalty and without having to give a reason.
- 2.35. Where participants' time and effort is compensated, care needs to be taken to ensure that such compensation does not undermine the voluntary nature of participation, or of withdrawing either participation or data without penalty.
- 2.36. The use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools should be considered with care and caution. For taught students, AI should not be used unless otherwise stated on a specific assignment brief, as outlined in the Code of Practice for Academic Misconduct. For staff and doctoral students, AI tools should not be used if they violate any other aspect of this policy including (but not being limited to): compromising the highest standards of research, compromising institutional and/or individual reputation; contributing wholly or partially to the



falsification of data; or presenting materials not created by an author as if they were one's own (plagiarism). As outlined by UKRI (2024²), generative AI poses potential risks pertaining to: rigour, transparency, originality, reliability, data protection, confidentiality, intellectual property, copyright and bias.

- 2.37. In cases where AI can be used for research purposes, full reference to the specific tool used, and for what, should always be given, to ensure transparency and appropriate acknowledgement.
- 2.38. Project or funder specific guidelines should always be followed and it is the responsibility of the researcher/applicant to identify whether there are regulations that prohibit or restrict the use of AI, or other similar tools, prior to commencing their project. For instance, The British Council provide useful guidance on the use of AI in the application process³.

3. Respect for the person: Gaining informed consent

- 3.1 Researchers have a responsibility to consider seriously and comprehensively the question of informing participants in the research of the content of that research. The working principle should be that participants in research should freely give their informed consent to the research process and its outcomes. In particular, participants should be informed of any negative effects which the research may have on them (for example, emotionally, professionally, in terms of stress).
- 3.2 Power imbalances in the process of seeking informed consent should always be considered carefully. The right not to participate or to withdraw without consequences must be made explicit to the intended participants.
- 3.3 The researcher must provide to the participants, prior to their participation, a clear and fair description, in writing, of the research using the appropriate adapted clearance form as outlined in the Procedure for Seeking Research Ethics Approval, or in other forms as appropriate to their level of literacy and/or access needs. The researcher must honour all promises and commitments included in that agreement with the exception of matters arising from the research which are likely to result in the continuation of illegal activity and/or harm to the individual or others. The researcher must inform all participants, in ways that can be understood by them, about all aspects that might reasonably be expected to influence their willingness to participate, as well as answer honestly all participants' questions. Wherever possible written consent should be obtained before any data collection takes place.
- 3.4 In cultures or settings where written consent would be difficult to gain, alternative modes of consent such as verbal consent, may be appropriate along with relevant evidence.
- 3.5 Research with children and young people (i.e. those under the age of 18) must seek the informed consent of parents/legal guardians before seeking the informed consent / assent of the children and young people. Where replies are not received from the parents/legal guardians, staff cannot approach the children and young people.

² <https://www.ukri.org/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-and-assessment-policy/use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-preparation-and-assessment/#section-our-policy>

³ <https://www.britishcouncil.org/work/jobs/application-process/ai>



- 3.6 Exceptions for seeking the informed consent of parents/legal guardians may occur for students of the institution where they are collecting data, whereby another employee such as a Head Teacher gives authorisation *in loco parentis* for the children/vulnerable adults to be approached for their informed consent, in cases where participation forms part of normal daily activity, and whereby no personal data are collected.
- 3.7 The consent of children and young people, and vulnerable adults must be obtained in such a way that is appropriate for their understanding and in ways which safeguard them. The researcher should check regularly throughout the project that the participants are still content to continue.
- 3.8 The process of gaining informed consent includes the researcher ensuring that the participants (and/or their parents/ legal guardians) have an understanding, from the outset, of the potential secondary use of data and consent to this possible use in journal articles, conference presentations or similar. Participants should also be aware that some research funding bodies have the expectation that anonymised data collected for a specific research project may be used subsequently by other researchers (e.g. UKRC data sets).
- 3.9 For research which is collaborative across institutions, informed consent should be obtained from the participants where the research is to be conducted.
- 3.10 If applicable, the researcher should also gain the permission of the study participants to have personal data transferred overseas as part of the project, particularly where the data storage mechanisms may be less secure or if the data may be used subsequently for other research projects.
- 3.11 Participants must be made aware of who will be able to access their data, what their data will be used for and for how long their data will be stored.
- 3.12 The implications of research with participants of a substantially different cultural background to that of the researcher should be considered at a very early stage in the research design. This consideration should include partnership with an informed member of the population from which the research sample is to be drawn, in order to check for foreseeable threats to psychological well-being, health, values and dignity. The proposal should then be submitted to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee.
- 3.13 Informed consent need not always be obtained for data to be used in research that is already in the public domain, e.g. traditionally open data such as school SATS results, Ofsted reports or other literary texts. However, in using data the researcher should be committed not to misrepresent data, and to maintain the highest standards of research integrity outlined in the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (Universities UK, 2025). The sources should be appropriately referenced and acknowledged.
- 3.14 In exceptional circumstances, the researcher may require either the withholding of full disclosure to participants prior to obtaining informed consent, or the use of concealment or deception. Deception (i.e., research without consent) should only be used as a last resort when no other approach is viable. All potential projects in this category must be submitted to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee for full consideration. Applicants would need to demonstrate a case for the usefulness of the research, and that any such deception is essential, before this could be considered viable.



4 Respect for the data and the confidentiality of the participants

- 4.1. When designing a research study/project, where the data collected may relate to identifiable living individuals, the researcher must ensure that the UK Data Protection Act 2018 (and/or any subsequent amendments or successors of the Act) is referred to and taken into account. All research should comply with GDPR and Lincoln Bishop University's Data Protection Policy.
- 4.2. Procedures to protect confidentiality should be outlined in documentation initially given to the participant when informed consent is obtained. Information obtained about a participant during the course of an investigation must be treated as confidential unless otherwise agreed upon in advance. Where the possibility exists that others may obtain access to such information, this possibility, together with the plans for protecting confidentiality, should be explained to the participant as part of the procedure for obtaining informed consent.
- 4.3. Data should ordinarily be anonymised. Any data that may be identifiable requires due consideration, to ensure GDPR compliance.
- 4.4. After data have been collected, participants should be provided with information about the nature of the study and best efforts should be made such that any misconceptions that may have arisen be removed. Where scientific or humane values justify delaying or withholding this information, the researcher has a special responsibility to monitor the research and to ensure that there are no damaging consequences for the participant.
- 4.5. The integrity and security of electronic and paper data storage mechanisms, for data already stored, should be audited periodically by the researcher(s); the procedures for this should be detailed in the research project proposal and design documents. In general data held electronically as files should be encrypted and password protected. In line with the IT User Policy, we strongly recommend storing data on one's Lincoln Bishop University OneDrive storage space. If data need to be stored elsewhere for any period of time, this needs to be outlined clearly in the application form.
- 4.6. When deciding on how and what data should be stored, who has access to it and how it will be used, the researcher must ensure that the provisions of the UK Data Protection Act 2018 (and/or any subsequent amendments or successors of the Act) are adhered to, and clearly shown in the project proposals and design documents. This should also include decisions on how long the data should be kept, how it should be disposed of and what safeguards would be in place if the data had to be transferred, either within the UK or overseas. Consent is required for data gathering and storage, and participants must be informed as to who will have access to their data. This may include third parties, such as transcription services. Furthermore, consent must always be obtained to retain any data beyond the project's lifecycle. Any student enquiries regarding this should be directed to the supervisor in the first instance, and staff enquiries to regulatorycompliance@lincolnbishop.ac.uk.
- 4.7. Researchers need to state clearly the legal basis for the data collection. In the main, research will be carried out in the public interest, and this should be communicated to participants via an Information Sheet. If the legal basis differs to this, details will need to be outlined clearly in the application form and to participants.



- 4.8. Care needs to be given to the ethical dissemination of the data. Results should normally be reported in such a way that the identity of individuals cannot be determined. However, particularly in qualitative research, where participants have distinctive characteristics, they may be recognisable and the complexities of protecting them need to be carefully considered and discussed with the participants at an early stage of the process. Researchers should take care not to make unrealistic assurances of confidentiality. Researchers should take care to anonymise data fully.
- 4.9. In some cases, participants may wish their name and other identifying features to be made public in the dissemination of the research (e.g. a case study on excellent practice, or oral histories). In such cases, the participants' permission should be obtained in writing.
- 4.10. Researchers should show a sympathetic awareness of the research community within which they are working. Where criticism of others' results or methods is deemed necessary, this should always be informed and carefully considered.
- 4.11. Researchers who judge that the effect of the agreements they have made with participants, on confidentiality and anonymity, will allow the continuation of illegal behaviour, which has come to light in the course of the research, must carefully consider making disclosure to the appropriate authorities. If the behaviour is likely to be harmful to the participants or to others, the researchers must also consider disclosure. Insofar as it does not undermine or obviate the disclosure, researchers must apprise the participants or their guardians or responsible others of their intentions and reasons for disclosure (BERA, 2024).
- 4.12. Researchers must not fabricate, falsify, distort or misrepresent research findings, nor plagiarise the work of others. Particular care should be taken to ensure full and appropriate citation of the work of others using an appropriate reference format.
- 4.13. The University requires all researchers to deposit, in the institutional repository (Lincoln Bishop Research Online), the full text of peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings with an ISSN, subject to copyright provisions, in accordance with the Open Access Publications Policy.

References

British Education Research Association (2024) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, Fourth Edition*, London: BERA

Universities UK (2025) *The Concordat to Support Research Integrity*. London: Universities