Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies

SUPERVISION AGREEMENT

The doctorate aims at producing high-quality, independent research. The primary goal of doctoral supervision is to provide individually tailored support for the development of skills and knowledge and to increase the scientific output of the doctoral researcher, while keeping the duration of the doctoral research in an appropriate timeframe (approx. four years). This supervision agreement certifies the supervision relationship between the doctoral researcher and the supervising scientist(s) and should be completed, signed and submitted to the respective department head and the IAMO Graduate School Coordinator within the first three months of the doctorate.

CONTENTS

The following agreements may only be amended or supplemented by mutual agreement of all parties involved. The amendments need to be laid down in Annex 1 with signatures of all parties involved.

1. PARTIES INVOLVED

Doctoral researcher[1]

Born

Formal supervisor[2]

Daily supervisor[3]

(*More lines may be added in case additional supervisors are involved)*

Faculty and University

Scientific/academic discipline

Aspired degree

It is agreed that the doctoral researcher and supervisor(s) familiarize themselves with the doctorate regulation (Promotionsordnung) of the respective faculty and comply with the respective requirements.

2. SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION, DEPARTMENT AND FOCAL POINT OF RESEARCH

Subject (working title)

Department

Keywords

[1] Doctoral researcher: is a postgraduate researcher with intention to receive a doctoral degree. The doctoral researcher has confirmed supervisors at IAMO, a working or scholarship contract at IAMO and is typically at the end of year 1 enrolled as doctoral researcher at the faculty where the dissertation is intended to be submitted.
[2] Formal supervisor: An authorized examiner at an institute of the faculty to which the dissertation is intended to be submitted. Formal supervisor and daily supervisor can be the same person.
[3] Daily supervisor: A senior researcher from IAMO, who does not need to be an authorized examiner at the faculty to which the dissertation will be submitted. Typically, the daily supervisor is the main responsible person to support the doctoral researcher in the design and realization of the doctoral project and the personal qualification plan of the doctoral researcher on a regular basis.

3. THESIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

If not otherwise agreed, a Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC) is established for each doctoral researcher. The key purpose of the TAC is to improve the quality of the thesis project by spreading supervision to more than one person and thus beyond the core team. The TAC's role is to provide guidance and feedback during the doctoral studies, monitor the progress of the thesis, secure achievement of the goals of the doctoral project, resolve conflicts, and to support career planning. The TAC should be established within the first six months of the doctoral project and meets at least once per year to provide a transparent review of the progress of the doctoral thesis. A TAC has to be established in a separate agreement (Annex 2).

If otherwise agreed: Please elaborate on the reasons why, in mutual consent, no TAC is going to be established.

4. TERMS OF SUPERVISION

The doctoral researcher, formal supervisor and daily supervisor hereby agree to a regular exchange in personal meetings (online or physical) at least three times a year. These meetings have the objective to monitor the progress of the doctoral project, discuss methods and topics and to plan next steps. With reference to Annex 3, the minimum tasks and responsibilities are detailed in mutual consent for each supervision team member as follows:

Tasks and responsibilities of formal supervisor

Tasks and responsibilities of daily supervisor:

(Add additional "task and responsibilities" text boxes in case additional supervisors are involved)

Tasks and responsibilities of doctoral researcher:

5. GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE AND RESEARCH ETHICS

The doctoral researcher and all supervising persons agree that the DFG Code of Conduct "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice", the Rules of Good Scientific Practice in place at IAMO (Annex 4) and the IAMO Code of Research Ethics (Annex 5) are known to them and that they shall adhere to these. For the aforementioned dissertation project, the following variants of reflection on ethical questions are selected within the first 6 months:

☐ Attending a workshop on basic ethical questions and project-specific issues

☐ Presenting a project introduction that entails a detailed discussion of the project's ethical implications at a research-team meeting

☐ Preparing a detailed discussion of the project's ethical implications within the project consortium

☐ Discussing in detail basic ethical questions and project-specific issues with one of the dissertation supervisors. Outcomes are laid down according to Appendix A of the IAMO Code of Research Ethics.

6. ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

A) The doctoral researcher is expected to attend theoretical, methodological and soft skill modules at postgraduate level which should provide tailored support for individual research and dissemination process. Participation in the Doctoral Certificate Program in Agricultural Economics (DCPAE) or a comparable structured doctoral program in another area of research is strongly recommended. The DCPAE is offered in modules. In total, 30 credit points (CP) need to be obtained in the following areas:

1. Methodological-theoretical modules: 18 CP
2. Soft skills (also incl. social and emotional competence): 6 CP
3. Colloquia 6 CP

The choice of modules should be based on individual decision in consultation with the supervisors. Modules outside the regular curriculum of the DCPAE (e.g., courses offered by the International Graduate Academy (InGrA) of Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (MLU)) may also be credited within DCPAE. Participation in external modules should be clarified with the supervisors. CP recognition within DCPAE needs to be clarified with the program's contact person at IAMO (currently Franziska Schaft) ahead of participation.

B) Participation in interdisciplinary qualifications, such as in seminars or workshops, is encouraged.

7. FUNDING AND WORKPLACE

A) Agreement regarding the funding of the doctoral researcher

B) Is the project implemented (partially) outside of Germany?

☐ Yes, namely in:

☐ No

If yes, how is the field research outside of Germany funded?

☐ via IAMO

☐ from external sources:

☐ with private funds:

Independent of funding, IAMO may offer the doctoral researcher a workplace, to the extent that the capacity of the institute permits this.

8. DOCTORAL RESEARCH PROJECT

A detailed description of the research project, the work plan and the provisional content of the dissertation is to be presented to the supervising persons in the end of year 1. The presentation should comprise the following points:

A) Description of the research project (approx. 2,500 words)

(1) Detailed problem definition and research objective

(2) Methodological design

(3) Scientific/academic significance

(4) Relevance for policy (where relevant) and dissemination of findings

(5) References (bibliographical)

B) Work plan

(6) Detailed work plan of the research project for the first year

(7) Rough plan for the subsequent/remaining parts of the dissertation project

C) The planned form of the dissertation

- ☐ Monograph
- ☐ Cumulative thesis articles accepted by professional journals
- ☐ Not yet decided

D) Language

- ☐ German
- ☐ English

9. CO-OPERATION (WHERE RELEVANT)

Who are the co-operation partners for the research project?

- ☐ Universities (apart from university, where thesis will be submitted):
- ☐ (Extra-university) institutes:
- ☐ Ministries, other governmental bodies:
- ☐ Other institutions:

10. ADDITIONAL TASKS

Supervisors might ask the doctoral researcher to engage in tasks outside of the thesis related research (e.g. contribution to projects, supervision of Bachelor and Master theses, teaching). However, scholarship holders are not subject to direction and only engage on the basis of mutual agreement.

- ☐ Contribution to project:
- ☐ Supervision of Bachelor and Master theses:
- ☐ Teaching contributions to modules:
- ☐ Other tasks or agreements:

11. SPECIAL MEASURES FOR RECONCILING WORK AND PRIVATE LIFE

IAMO aims at reconciling an appropriate balance between work and the private situation of doctoral researchers (e.g. existence of children, family members in need of care etc.). The following agreements are made:

12. SIGNATURES

Doctoral researcher

First name:		Surname:	
E-mail:		Telephone:	
Full address:			

Formal supervisor

First name:		Surname:	
E-mail:		Telephone:	
Full address:			

Daily Supervisor

First name:		Surname:	
E-mail:		Telephone:	
Full address:			

(further boxes may be added in case more supervisors are involved)

Name of doctoral researcher	Place/Date	Signature
Name of formal supervisor	Place/Date	Signature
Name of daily supervisor (if any)	Place/Date	Signature

ANNEX 1 AMENDMENTS TO SUPERVISION AGREEMENT

The following amendments and/or supplements are inserted to the original version of the supervision agreement template:

The amendments and/or supplements inserted above are complete and have been concluded in mutual agreement of all parties involved:

Name of doctoral researcher	Place/Date	Signature
Name of formal supervisor	Place/Date	Signature
Name of daily supervisor (if any)	Place/Date	Signature

(further signatures may be added in case more supervisors are involved)

ANNEX 2 THESIS ADVISORY COMMITTEES: AGREEMENT AND ANNEX

Agreement on
Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC)

The purpose of this document is to establish a Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC). The rights and responsibilities of the doctoral researcher and the TAC members are defined in the "Framework for Thesis Advisory Committees" (Annex).

(Name of doctoral researcher) (Name of formal supervisor)

(Working title of the doctoral project)

By signing this document, I accept the tasks and responsibilities stated in "Framework for Thesis Advisory Committees" (see below). In addition, the following specific agreement are made:

TAC members

Name of doctoral researcher	Place/Date	Signature
Name of formal supervisor	Place/Date	Signature
Name of daily supervisor (if any)	Place/Date	Signature
Name of advisor	Place/Date	Signature
Name of advisor	Place/Date	Signature
Name of advisor	Place/Date	Signature

-Annex-
Agreement on
Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC)

FRAMEWORK FOR THESIS ADVISORY COMMITTEES

PURPOSE

In cooperation with the supervisor(s) defined in the supervision agreement, the TAC's role is to provide guidance and feedback during the doctoral studies, monitor the progress of the thesis, ensure transparency in the evaluation criteria, secure achievement of the goals of the doctoral project, resolve conflicts, and to support career planning.

COMPOSITION

The TAC includes the supervisor(s) and one to five additional independent[4] advisors who are willing to support the doctoral researcher in the dissertation project. TAC members should possess scientific expertise in the topics and/or the methods related to the thesis.

The committee will be selected jointly by the doctoral researcher and the formal supervisor within the first six months of the doctorate (in consultation with the potential members). The formal supervisor ultimately ensures that the TAC is established. Advisors can be added or may be replaced in agreement with the committee members at any time. This has to be documented in writing.

TASKS OF TAC MEMBERS

Advisory committee

- Attends the TAC meetings
- Advises the doctoral researcher on the development of the doctoral project
- Reads and comments on manuscript draft, where relevant
- Helps in building the professional network
- Advises the doctoral researcher in career planning
- Advises the doctoral researcher in case of conflict

Doctoral researcher

- Convenes the TAC and organizes the meetings
- Reports about progress of the doctoral project (milestones, publications, delays), future workplan, details further qualification requirements and development wishes
- Distributes the necessary documents incl. meeting agenda for the TAC meeting to the TAC members at least one week in advance
- Documents the TAC meetings by written minutes with an executive summary

MEETINGS

The TAC should be set up in the first six months of the doctoral project and automatically dissolves with the defense of the thesis. The TAC meets at least once per year to monitor the progress of the

[4] Can be member of other scientific departments at IAMO or is affiliated with any organization.

doctoral researcher. It can also convene for other occasions, e.g. in case of conflicts. In advance, it should be transparently and clearly defined which documents are to be provided. A meeting agenda should be developed by the doctoral researcher in consultation with the supervisors.

INFORMATION & DOCUMENTATION

TAC agreement, TAC meeting protocol and materials prepared for TAC meetings are accessible as electronic files to all members of the advisory committee, the doctoral researcher, as well as the department head and the coordinator of the IAMO Graduate School.

ANNEX 3 TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES[5]

Supervision team

- Formal supervisor: Available for regular periodic meetings (at least 3 per year) to discuss thesis progress, arising problems and challenges, workplan, timelines and milestones.
- Formal supervisor: Ensures that required equipment and facilities are available.
- Formal supervisor: Discusses career perspectives/issues of career development (e.g. in the framework of an annual development interview and/or TAC).
- Formal supervisor: Ensures the establishment of TAC in the first six months of the doctoral project (if applicable).
- Daily supervisor: Available as day-to-day contact point for doctoral researcher on the basis of regular meetings.
- Advises the doctoral researcher in the design and realization of the doctoral project.
- Advises on the design/implementation of scientific qualification plan (e.g. choice of suitable doctoral programme, choice of modules in Doctoral Certificate Program in Agricultural Economics (DCPAE), participation in conferences, seminars).
- Promotes publication opportunities, supports professional network building.
- Assists the doctoral researcher in detailing the work plan/milestones, monitors progress.
- Responsible for the timely conclusion of the supervision agreement.
- Ensures that initial research outline and workplan is presented and discussed in the end of year 1 (if applicable: in the framework of the TAC).
- Ensures awareness of standards for good scientific practice as set by the DFG Code of Conduct Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice, the IAMO Rules of Good Scientific Practice (Annex 4) and the IAMO Code of Research Ethics (Annex 5) and rules supporting the implementation of these codes within IAMO.
- Ensures that doctoral researcher presents at least once and regularly attends IAMO/MLU PhD seminar (or - if applicable - another PhD seminar).
- Is a member of the graduation committee delegated by faculty to evaluate the defense („final disputation“) (if applicable - depending on doctorate regulation).
- Serves as thesis evaluator/reviewer (if applicable - depending on doctorate regulation).
- …

Doctoral researcher

- Writes research resume and workplan until end of year 1.
- Regularly meets with supervisors to discuss progress of research work.
- Approaches supervisors proactively to facilitate meetings.
- Works independently and delivers outputs timely.
- Communicates problems and delays as soon as possible.
- Familiarizes with and understands the legal regulations for doctoral research at the graduation faculty.
- Presents the work at least once and participates regularly in IAMO/MLU PhD seminar or comparable formats.
- Participates in Doctoral Certificate Program in Agricultural Economics (DCPAE) or comparable doctoral program.
- Actively finds out about relevant further training opportunities and consults on this with supervisors.

[5] Tasks and distribution of tasks may vary among supervision teams, further points might be added, existing points may be amended in mutual consent of all parties involved. Note: the first five tasks in the list define already the responsibility of a certain supervisor type. The responsibility for all other tasks may be discussed among parties involved. Amendments need to be laid down in Annex 1.

- Follows the standards for good scientific practice as set by the DFG Code of Conduct Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice, the IAMO Rules of Good Scientific Practice (Annex 4) and the IAMO Code of Research Ethics (Annex 5) and rules supporting the implementation of these codes within IAMO.
- ...

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies

Guideline for Good Scientific Practice and Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO)

(version 29.06.2021)

- Inofficial English translation -

Adopted by the IAMO directorate on 14 June 2021 during their meeting regarding the implementation of the Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice (Code of Conduct) of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

Preamble

IAMO commits itself to the Leibniz Code for Good Research Practice (Leibniz Association 2021) and the respective valid Guideline on Good Scientific Practice of the Leibniz Association (2019a) and recognises the Code "Guidelines for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice" of the DFG (DFG 2019a) in the respective current version as a legally binding reference for their application. All employees of IAMO are obliged to comply with the Code. IAMO informs their staff comprehensively about the Code and offers supportive advice and necessary training to ensure compliance.

IAMO ensures the implementation of the Code with institute-specific concepts and agreements that serve to ensure good scientific practice as defined in the Code. The full text of the Code is integrated into this IAMO Guideline. In the following, the 19 guidelines of the DFG Code (levels 1 and 2), which IAMO fully recognises, are concretised by IAMO-specific explanations. These concretisations primarily specify the election procedure of the ombudspersons, their tasks and powers, as well as the procedures for ensuring good scientific practice and dealing with allegations of scientific misconduct in accordance with the guidelines of the Leibniz Association. Furthermore, possibilities for sanctions at the institute level in the event of scientific misconduct by IAMO employees are described in more detail.

This regulation comes into force on the day after its publication. It replaces IAMO's previous rules on good scientific practice of 27.05.2002.

Guideline 1: Commitment to the general principles

► IAMO, with the participation of their members, defines rules of good research practice, ensure that their employees are made aware of these guidelines and related policies and regulations, and require their employees to comply with them with due regard for the type of research undertaken in the relevant subject area. Individual researchers are responsible for ensuring that their own conduct complies with the standards of good research practice.

Explanations:

In particular, the principles include working lege artis, maintaining strict honesty in attributing one's own contributions and those of others, rigorously questioning all findings, and permitting and promoting critical discourse within the research community. The principles of good research practice are set out in the following guidelines.

Guideline 2: Professional ethics

► Researchers are responsible for putting the fundamental values and norms of research into practice and advocating for them. Education in the principles of good research begins at the earliest possible stage in academic teaching and research training. Researchers at all career levels regularly update their knowledge about the standards of good research practice and the current state of the art.

Explanations:

Experienced and early career researchers support each other in a process of continuous mutual learning and ongoing training and maintain a regular dialogue.

Guideline 3: Organisational responsibility of heads of research institutions

► The IAMO management creates the basic framework for research. They are responsible for ensuring adherence to and the promotion of good practice, and for appropriate career support for all researchers. The heads of IAMO guarantee the necessary conditions to enable researchers to comply with legal and ethical standards. The basic framework includes clear written policies and procedures for staff selection and development as well as for early career support and equal opportunity.

Explanations and concretisation:

The IAMO management is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate organisational structure is in place at the institution. They ensure that the tasks of leadership, supervision, quality assurance and conflict management are clearly allocated in accordance with the size of individual research work units and suitably communicated to members and employees.

Transparent and fair staff selection and development are ensured at IAMO by the principles for staff selection laid down in writing in the service agreement on staff appointments at IAMO

(Staffing Guidelines). Gender equality and the diversity of the staff as well as the avoidance of unconscious bias are explicitly taken into account.

Suitable supervisory structures and policies are established for early career researchers. Honest career advice, training opportunities and mentoring are offered to researchers and research support staff.

Guideline 4: Responsibility of the heads of research work units

► The head of a research work unit is responsible for the entire unit. Collaboration within the unit is designed such that the group as a whole can perform its tasks, the necessary cooperation and coordination can be achieved, and all members understand their roles, rights and duties. The leadership role includes ensuring adequate individual supervision of early career researchers, integrated in the overall institutional policy, as well as career development for researchers and research support staff. Suitable organisational measures are in place at the level of the individual unit and of the leadership of the institution to prevent the abuse of power and exploitation of dependent relationships.

Explanations and concretisation:

The size and the organisation of the unit are designed to allow leadership tasks, particularly skills training, research support and supervisory duties, to be performed appropriately. The performance of leadership tasks is associated with a corresponding responsibility. Researchers and research support staff benefit from a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. They are given adequate status with corresponding rights of participation. Through gradually increasing autonomy, they are empowered to shape their career.

IAMO's concept for the promotion of young researchers describes the supervision structures and concepts established at IAMO. Each doctoral researcher is assigned at least one academic supervisor and one other qualified person. These are responsible for the appropriate supervision of the qualification work in accordance with the rules of good scientific practice, the communication of development and qualification opportunities and the promotion of presentation and publication opportunities. A supervision agreement is binding for all doctoral researchers and should be signed by them and their supervisors within the first three months of the doctoral phase. Additions and revisions are possible by mutual agreement. Following the supplement to the 2019 Guideline on Career Development in the Leibniz Association for the Doctoral Phase (Leibniz-Gemeinschaft 2019b), the quality of supervision is ensured by a four- or multi-eye principle with supervisory teams. As a rule, individually tailored "Thesis Advisory Committees" are established, which meet regularly for a transparent review of the progress of the doctoral thesis. A detailed description is set out in the current version of IAMO's "Concept for the Promotion of Young Researchers".

Guideline 5: Dimensions of performance and assessment criteria

► To assess the performance of researchers, a multidimensional approach is called for; in addition to academic and scientific achievements, other aspects may be taken into consideration. Performance is assessed primarily on the basis of qualitative measures, while quantitative indicators may be incorporated into the overall assessment only with appropriate differentiation and reflection. Where provided voluntarily, individual circumstances stated in curricula vitae – as well as the categories specified in the German General Equal Treatment Act (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz) – are taken into account when forming a judgement.

Explanations:

High-quality research is oriented towards criteria specific to individual disciplines. In addition to the generation of and critical reflection on findings, other aspects of performance are taken into consideration in the evaluation process. Examples include involvement in teaching, academic self-governance, public relations, and knowledge and technology transfer; contributions to the general good of society may also be recognised. An individual's approach to research, such as an openness to new findings and a willingness to take risks, is also considered. Appropriate allowance is made for periods of absence due to personal, family or health reasons or for prolonged training or qualification phases resulting from such periods, and for alternative career paths or similar circumstances.

Guideline 6: Ombudspersons

► The IAMO researchers appoint at least one independent ombudsperson to whom their members and employees can turn with questions relating to good research practice and in cases of suspected misconduct. They take sufficient care to ensure that people are aware of who the ombudspersons at the institution are. For each ombudsperson there must be a designated substitute in case there is any concern about conflicts of interest or in case the ombudsperson is unable to carry out his or her duties.

Explanations and concretisation:

Ombudspersons may not serve as members of the IAMO directorate while serving in this role. The term of office of ombudspersons is limited to four years. A further term of office is possible. Scientists with integrity and management experience are eligible to be selected as ombudspersons. All IAMO scientists with a first university degree qualifying them for a profession are eligible for nomination of ombudspersons.

A nomination will only be considered if the nominee has declared his/her willingness to accept the office. The ombudspersons should be elected from among IAMO's scientist. In exceptional cases, a scientist who is not a member of the institute may also be elected. If possible, the ombudspersons should not belong to the same department. The appointment of the ombudspersons shall be announced publicly on the institute's website and on the intranet,

stating how to reach them.

The ombudspersons advise as neutral and qualified contact persons in questions of good scientific practice and in suspected cases of scientific misconduct and contribute, as far as possible, to solution-oriented conflict mediation. The ombudspersons accept enquiries while maintaining confidentiality and, if necessary, forward suspected cases of scientific misconduct to the responsible body, usually an investigative commission, at their institution. The two ombudspersons may exchange information for the purpose of mutual consultation, unless explicitly requested otherwise.

The ombudspersons exercise their office in an honorary capacity, independently and free of instructions. They are to be supported in the exercise of their office by all stakeholders. The ombudspersons receive the necessary related support and acceptance from IAMO in the performance of their duties. They are supported by the institution in obtaining appropriate qualifications. In order to increase the functionality of the ombudsperson system, the institution provides for measures to relieve the ombudspersons in other ways.

IAMO scientists are free to turn to the DFG's "Ombudsman for Science" body or the Leibniz Association's central ombudsman body instead of IAMO's ombudspersons.

Guideline 7: Cross-phase quality assurance

► Researchers carry out each step of the research process *lege artis*. When research findings are made publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels), the quality assurance mechanisms used are always explained. This applies especially when new methods are developed.

Explanations:

Continuous quality assurance during the research process includes, in particular, compliance with subject-specific standards and established methods, processes such as equipment calibration, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, the selection and use of research software, software development and programming, and the keeping of laboratory notebooks. If researchers have made their findings publicly available and subsequently become aware of inconsistencies or errors in them, they make the necessary corrections. If the inconsistencies or errors constitute grounds for retracting a publication, the researchers will promptly request the publisher, infrastructure provider, etc. to correct or retract the publication and make a corresponding announcement. The same applies if researchers are made aware of such inconsistencies or errors by third parties. The origin of the data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process is disclosed and the reuse of data is clearly indicated; original sources are cited. The nature and the scope of research data generated during the research process are described. Research data are handled in accordance with the requirements of the relevant subject area. The source code of publicly available software must be persistent, citable and documented. Depending on the

particular subject area, it is an essential part of quality assurance that results or findings can be replicated or confirmed by other researchers (for example with the aid of a detailed description of materials and methods).

Guideline 8: Stakeholders, responsibilities and roles

► The roles and responsibilities of the researchers and research support staff participating in a research project must be clear at each stage of the project.

Explanations and concretisation:

The participants in a research project engage in regular dialogue. For all research projects at IAMO, the roles and responsibilities of the participants must be clearly defined and adjusted as necessary in consultation with all participants. An adjustment is particularly indicated if the focus of the work of one of the participants in the research project changes. For doctoral projects, roles and responsibilities are set out in writing in a supervision agreement.

Guideline 9: Research design

► Researchers take into account and acknowledge the current state of research when planning a project. To identify relevant and suitable research questions, they familiarise themselves with existing research in the public domain. HEIs and non-HEI research institutions ensure that the necessary basic framework for this is in place.

Explanations:

Methods to avoid (unconscious) distortions in the interpretation of findings, e.g. the use of blinding in experiments, are used where possible. Researchers examine whether and to what extent gender and diversity dimensions may be of significance to the research project (with regard to methods, work programme, objectives, etc.). The context in which the research was conducted is taken into consideration when interpreting findings.

Guideline 10: Legal and ethical frameworks, usage rights

► Researchers adopt a responsible approach to the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research. They comply with rights and obligations, particularly those arising from legal requirements and contracts with third parties, and where necessary seek approvals and ethics statements and present these when required. With regard to research projects, the potential consequences of the research should be evaluated in detail and the ethical aspects should be assessed. The legal framework of a research project includes documented agreements on usage rights relating to data and results generated by the project.

Explanations:

Researchers maintain a continual awareness of the risks associated with the misuse of research results. Their responsibility is not limited to compliance with legal requirements but also includes an obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills such that risks can be recognised,

assessed and evaluated. The IAMO is responsible for ensuring that its members' and employees' actions comply with regulations and promote this through suitable organisational structures. They provide binding ethical guidance and policies and define procedures to assess ethical issues relating to research projects.[16] Where possible and practicable, researchers conclude documented agreements on usage rights at the earliest possible point in a research project. Documented agreements are especially useful when multiple academic and/or non-academic institutions are involved in a research project or when it is likely that a researcher will move to a different institution and continue using the data he or she generated for his or her own research purposes. In particular, the researcher who collected the data is entitled to use them. During a research project, those entitled to use the data decide whether third parties should have access to them (subject to data protection regulations).

Guideline 11: Methods and standards

► To answer research questions, researchers use scientifically sound and appropriate methods. When developing and applying new methods, they attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

Explanations:

The application of a method normally requires specific expertise that is ensured, where necessary, by suitable cooperative arrangements. The establishment of standards for methods, the use of software, the collection of research data and the description of research results is essential for the comparability and transferability of research outcomes.

Guideline 12: Documentation

► Researchers document all information relevant to the production of a research result as clearly as is required by and is appropriate for the relevant subject area to allow the result to be reviewed and assessed. In general, this also includes documenting individual results that do not support the research hypothesis. The selection of results must be avoided. Where subject-specific recommendations exist for review and assessment, researchers create documentation in accordance with these guidelines. If the documentation does not satisfy these requirements, the constraints and the reasons for them are clearly explained. Documentation and research results must not be manipulated; they are protected as effectively as possible against manipulation.

Explanations:

An important basis for enabling replication is to make available the information necessary to understand the research (including the research data used or generated, the methodological, evaluation and analytical steps taken, and, if relevant, the development of the hypothesis), to

[6] IAMO-Code of Research Ethics (21.02.2019), http://de.wiki.iamo.de/images_de/a/a2/Code_of_Research_Ethics.pdf

ensure that citations are clear, and, as far as possible, to enable third parties to access this information. Where research software is being developed, the source code is documented.

Guideline 13: Providing public access to research results

► As a rule, researchers make all results available as part of scientific/academic discourse. In specific cases, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels); this decision must not depend on third parties. Researchers decide autonomously– with due regard for the conventions of the relevant subject area – whether, how and where to disseminate their results. If it has been decided to make results available in the public domain, researchers describe them clearly and in full. Where possible and reasonable, this includes making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, as well as the methods and software used, available and fully explaining the work processes. Software programmed by researchers themselves is made publicly available along with the source code. Researchers provide full and correct information about their own preliminary work and that of others.

Explanations:

In the interest of transparency and to enable research to be referred to and reused by others, whenever possible researchers make the research data and principal materials on which a publication is based available in recognized archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable). Restrictions may apply to public availability in the case of patent applications. If self-developed research software is to be made available to third parties, an appropriate license is provided. In line with the principle of "quality over quantity", researchers avoid splitting research into inappropriately small publications. They limit the repetition of content from publications of which they were (co-)authors to that which is necessary to enable the reader to understand the context. They cite results previously made publicly available unless, in exceptional cases, this is deemed unnecessary by the general conventions of the discipline.

Guideline 14: Authorship

► An author is an individual who has made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the content of a research publication of text, data or software. All authors agree on the final version of the work to be published. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they share responsibility for the publication. Authors seek to ensure that, as far as possible, their contributions are identified by publishers or infrastructure providers such that they can be correctly cited by users.

Explanations:

The contribution must add to the research content of the publication. What constitutes a genuine and identifiable contribution must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area in question. An identifiable, genuine contribution is deemed to exist particularly in

instances in which a researcher – in a research-relevant way – takes part in

- the development and conceptual design of the research project, or
- the gathering, collection, acquisition or provision of data, software or sources, or
- the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of data, sources and conclusions drawn from them, or
- the drafting of the manuscript.

If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, the individual's support may be properly acknowledged in footnotes, a foreword or an acknowledgement. Honorary authorship where no such contribution was made is not permissible. A leadership or supervisory function does not itself constitute co-authorship.

Collaborating researchers agree on authorship of a publication. The decision as to the order in which authors are named is made in good time, normally no later than when the manuscript is drafted, and in accordance with clear criteria that reflect the practices within the relevant subject areas. Researchers may not refuse to give their consent to publication of the results without sufficient grounds. Refusal of consent must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

Guideline 15: Publication medium

► Authors select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of discourse. Researchers who assume the role of editor carefully select where they will carry out this activity. The scientific/academic quality of a contribution does not depend on the medium in which it is published.

Explanations:

In addition to publication in books and journals, authors may also consider academic repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs. A new or unknown publication medium is evaluated to assess its seriousness.

A key criterion to selecting a publication medium is whether it has established guidelines on good research practice.

Guideline 16: Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions

► Fair behavior is the basis for the legitimacy of any judgement-forming process. Researchers who evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality with regard to this process. They disclose all facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest. The duty of confidentiality and disclosure of facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest also applies to members of research advisory and decision-making bodies.

Explanations:

The confidentiality of third-party material to which a reviewer or committee member gains access precludes sharing the material with third parties or making personal use of it. Researchers immediately disclose to the responsible body any potential or apparent conflicts of interest, bias or favoritism relating to the research project being reviewed or the person or matter being discussed.

Guideline 17: Archiving

► Researchers back up research data and results made publicly available, as well as the central materials on which they are based and the research software used, by adequate means according to the standards of the relevant subject area, and retain them for an appropriate period of time. Where justifiable reasons exist for not archiving particular data, researchers explain these reasons. HEIs and non-HEI research institutions ensure that the infrastructure necessary to enable archiving is in place.

Explanations and concretisation:

When scientific and academic findings are made publicly available, the research data (generally raw data) on which they are based are generally archived in an accessible and identifiable manner for a period of ten years at the IAMO where the data were produced or in cross-location repositories. In justified cases, shorter archiving periods may be appropriate; the reasons for this are described clearly and comprehensibly. The archiving period begins on the date when the results are made publicly available. The "Concept for Research Data Management at IAMO" provides further details on the handling of research data.

Guideline 18: Complainants and respondents

► The ombudspersons and investigating committees examining allegations of misconduct take appropriate measures to protect both the complainant and the respondent. The investigation of allegations of research misconduct must be carried out in strict confidentiality and adhere to the presumption of innocence. The information disclosed by the complainant must be provided in good faith. Knowingly false or malicious allegations may themselves constitute misconduct. The disclosure should not disadvantage the research or professional career prospects of either the complainant or the respondent.

Explanations and concretisation:

Particularly in the case of early career researchers, the disclosure should not lead to delays in the complainant's own qualification phase and no disadvantage should arise to the writing of final dissertations or doctoral theses; the same applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

The investigating body will respect the presumption of innocence vis-à-vis the respondent at each stage of the process when considering each case. The respondent should not experience any disadvantage resulting from the investigation of the allegation until such time as research misconduct has been formally established. The complainant must have objective reasons for suspecting that an infringement of the standards of good research practice may have occurred.

If the complainant is unable to verify the facts personally, or if there is uncertainty with regard to the interpretation of the guidelines on good research practice in relation to an observed set of circumstances, the complainant should consult the IAMO ombudsperson or the German Research Ombudsman (Gremium „Ombudsman für die Wissenschaft“) to clarify the suspicion.

The IAMO ombudspersons decide whether to investigate anonymous allegations. Disclosures made anonymously can only be investigated if the complainant provides the party investigating the allegation with solid and sufficiently concrete facts.

If the complainant’s identity is known, the investigating body will keep the individual’s name confidential and will not share it with third parties without the individual’s consent. Different requirements apply only if there is a legal obligation or if the respondent cannot otherwise properly defend himself or herself because, as an exception, the case concerns the identity of the complainant. The investigating body will promptly inform the complainant if his or her name is to be disclosed; the complainant can decide whether to withdraw the allegation due to the impending disclosure. The confidentiality of the process is limited if the complainant makes his or her suspicion public. The investigating body will decide on a case-by case basis how to handle the breach of confidentiality on the part of the complainant. Should research misconduct not be proven, the complainant must continue to be protected, assuming that the allegations cannot be shown to have been made against his or her better knowledge.

Should the complainant(s) not wish to contact the IAMO ombudspersons, the Leibniz Association's central ombudsman board (e-mail: ombudsgremium(at)leibniz-gemeinschaft.de; postal address: Leibniz Ombudsgremium, Leibniz Association, Chausseestraße 111, 10115 Berlin) can be contacted for clarification. It is also possible to turn to the "Ombudsman for Science" committee set up by the DFG (https://ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de/).

Guideline 19: Procedures in cases of alleged research misconduct

► The IAMO establish procedures to handle allegations of research misconduct. They define policies and regulations on the basis of a sufficient legal foundation. The regulations define the circumstances that constitute misconduct, procedural rules and the measures to take should an allegation be upheld. Regulations are applied in addition to relevant higher-level laws.

Explanations and concretisation:

Not every breach of good research practice constitutes misconduct. Only deliberate or grossly negligent infringements defined in a set of regulations are considered scientific misconduct.

Violations in the sense of scientific misconduct are described by the DFG in the Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct (DFG 2019b), the Procedural Guide to Good Scientific Practice (DFG 2020) and by the Leibniz Association in the Guideline on Good Scientific Practice in the Leibniz Association (§3) (Leibniz Association 2019a). These documents are used to guide IAMO procedures and possible consequences of violations that apply at IAMO. Particular examples of misconduct include fabrication of data, falsification of data and plagiarism. The above-mentioned regulations provide guidance regarding the responsibility for each step of a procedure, the consideration of evidence, substitutes for ombudspersons and members of investigation committees, conflicts of interest and the procedural principles of the rule of law.

In cases of suspected scientific misconduct, IAMO applies the following procedure: if IAMO's ombudspersons receive an allegation of scientific misconduct, they conduct a preliminary investigation independently and without delay. The respondent and the complainant are each given the opportunity to be heard at this stage of the process (orally or through a written statement). In order to clarify the facts, they may interview further persons and obtain expert opinions. The person affected by the allegations as well as the whistleblower shall be given the opportunity to comment at each stage of the proceedings. Until such time as it is demonstrated that misconduct has occurred, information relating to the individuals involved in the process and the findings of the investigation is treated in confidence. The IAMO ensures that the entire process is conducted as promptly as possible and implement the steps necessary to complete each stage of the procedure within an appropriate time frame.

After examining the facts of the case and hearing the statement of the person concerned, the ombudspersons make a decision as to whether the previous findings invalidate or strengthen the suspicion of misconduct. If the suspicion is confirmed and a solution to the conflict cannot be found, the ombudspersons instruct an investigative commission. The commission’s review is carried out according to whether there are behaviours and violations that are contrary to good scientific practice as listed in the DFG's Code of Procedure (2019b) under point II and in the Leibniz Association's guideline on good scientific practice under §3 (Leibniz Association 2019a).

In agreement with the IAMO directors and the chairperson of the Scientific Advisory Board, the ombudspersons shall appoint the members and deputy members of a case-specific commission to review scientific misconduct. The commission shall include one scientist from each scientific department and the ombudspersons as guests with an advisory vote. If necessary, external scientists can also be appointed as members of the commission. A deputy shall represent the respective member in the event that they are prejudiced or prevented from attending.

The Commission shall elect a Chairperson and a Deputy Chairperson from among its members. The Chairperson - or in the event of his/her being prevented, the Deputy Chairperson - shall invite to the meetings of the Commission, chair them and implement their resolutions. The Commission shall constitute a quorum if at least two members are present; a connection by telephone or other suitable means of communication shall be ensured. The Commission shall decide by simple

majority. Minutes of its meetings shall be taken and shall record the main outcome of the meeting. The Commission may consult other persons in an advisory capacity. The Commission shall organise its work in such a way as to ensure an expeditious procedure.

The Commission takes over the investigation results from the ombudspersons and decides on the further proceedings. It may discontinue the proceedings, in particular it may do so upon justified request of the informing person, or it may initiate further investigations or submit a basis for decision to the IAMO directorate.

The commission shall not deliberate in public. The persons concerned shall be heard at their request. For this purpose, they may call in a person of their confidence as an advisor. This also applies to other persons to be heard. The commission may inform the persons concerned of the names of the persons providing information. The persons providing the information shall be informed of the disclosure in advance.

If the Commission considers scientific misconduct to be proven, it shall report in writing to the directors of IAMO on the outcome of its investigations and propose the manner in which the proceedings should be continued, also with regard to safeguarding the rights of others. This report shall also be given to the persons concerned and to the informants. The files shall be kept for 10 years. Informants shall be protected from any adverse treatment. Intentional false accusations may be punished under service law.

The directorate shall review recommendations of the investigative commission and decide on the further course of action. The directors inform the investigative commission of their decision. If the person concerned is employed by IAMO, consequences under labour law such as a warning, dismissal or termination of contract may be considered in the case of scientific misconduct. Furthermore, consequences under civil law may be considered, such as the issuing of a ban from the premises, claims for restitution against those affected (for example, with regard to stolen material), claims for removal and injunctive relief under copyright law, personal rights law, patent law and competition law, claims for repayment (for example, of scholarships, third-party funding) or claims for damages by IAMO or third parties in the event of personal injury, damage to property or the like.

In order to enforce academic consequences, the directorate may transfer the proceedings to the respective university. In the event of misconduct relevant under criminal law, the directorate shall file charges. If the suspicion of academic misconduct has been wrongly raised, the directorate shall ensure rehabilitation after consultation with the accused person(s).

If, in the course of an investigation, it becomes apparent that a final clarification of the allegations is not possible within IAMO or that the conduct of the investigation is prevented by exceptional circumstances, the ombudspersons shall submit the case to the central ombudsman board of the Leibniz Association. This does not affect the possibility of turning to the "Ombudsman for Science" committee set up by the DFG.

Bibliography

DFG. 2019a. Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice: Code of Conduct (last access: 15 April 2020).

- 2019b. Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct (VerfOwF) (last access 15 September 2020).
- 2020. Verfahrensleitfaden zur guten wissenschaftlichen Praxis. Bonn: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft. 2019a. Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice in the Leibniz Association (last access: 10 June 2020).

- 2019b. Leitlinie Karriereentwicklung in der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft - Ergänzung: Ausgestaltung der Promotionsphase (last access: 10 February 2021).
- 2021. Leibniz Code for Good Scientific Practice

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies

IAMO Code of Research Ethics

IAMO Guidelines

IAMO closely follows the DFG White Paper on "Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice"[7] as well as the Recommendations made by the Leibniz Association for safeguarding good scientific practice and handling complaints concerning scientific misconduct[8]. Furthermore, the institute has developed several regulations to foster the awareness of all researchers towards good scientific practice and ethical questions related to their own scientific work. Those documents which relate to ethical questions and are already in place at IAMO should be taken into account in the ethical guidelines by referring to these when appropriate. Redundancy, duplication, or inconsistencies amongst the individual documents should be avoided.

- Rules of Good Scientific Practice
- Open Access Policy
- Overview of the formalities in the doctoral examination procedure
- Supervision Agreement

[7] http://www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/principles_dfg_funding/good_scientific_practice/index.html
[8] https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/en/research/good-scientific-practice/

All projects / researchers shall consult the IAMO Data-protection Supervisor in all issues related to data collection and data analysis.

Table of Contents

Preamble

The development and dissemination of (agricultural) economics and social science knowledge are social processes that require ethical considerations and decisions at every stage. (Agricultural) Economists and social scientists should be conscious of this dimension of social scientific knowledge production, knowledge use, and knowledge transfer at all times.
This code of research ethics shall serve to sensitise IAMO scientists to the ethical issues of their work, in particular the rights and concerns of those they study, and encourage them to critically examine their own professional activities. When conducting research or disseminating research results, IAMO scholars must ensure that they do not compromise the safety, dignity, or privacy of those with whom they work, conduct research, or carry out other professional activities and that their research does not result in any foreseeable negative consequences.

The code of research ethics is sustained through its ongoing discussion and its application by members of the social science and economics professions. These guidelines address the *general* contexts, priorities, and relationships to be considered in research ethics decision-making at or in the name of IAMO. Because no code of ethics can anticipate unique circumstances, each individual researcher must be willing to make carefully considered ethical choices and be prepared to make clear the assumptions, facts, and issues on which his or her decisions are based.

IAMO has established an ethics committee to ensure compliance with its code of research ethics. The principles on which the committee's work is based are identified in this code of ethics. For queries about good academic practice (avoiding plagiarism, not falsifying results, etc.), please refer to the IAMO “Rules of Good Scientific Practice”.

1. RESEARCH

A) Scientific integrity

(1) IAMO researchers strive for scientific integrity in the exercise of their vocation. They observe the IAMO "Rules of Good Scientific Practice" and are furthermore bound by the highest possible standards in research, teaching, and professional practice. Because IAMO scholars provide specialist judgements, it is essential that they clearly and adequately describe their area of work, state of knowledge, expertise, methods, and experience.

(2) Scientific research results will only be presented or published without the falsifying omission of findings. Scholars will disclose all relevant details about their theories, methods, data access, and research designs (which are important for evaluating research results and the limits of the validity thereof) to the best of their knowledge.

(3) IAMO researchers shall list all sources of financing for their research in their publications. They must ensure that their findings are not biased by their funders' interests. IAMO researchers are also not permitted to accept any grants, contracts, or research assignments which may undermine the principles set out in this code of ethics.

(4) The division of responsibilities; remuneration; data access; copyrights; and other affected rights, responsibilities, and arrangements shall be clarified at the beginning of any joint projects IAMO researchers are participating in and accepted by all parties. Should conditions change, such matters can be corrected by agreement during the project.

(5) IAMO scholars bear a social responsibility in their roles as researchers, teachers, and practitioners. Their recommendations, decisions, and claims can affect the lives of their fellow humans. They should be aware of the situations and intrinsic constraints that could lead to their influence being misused. Researchers shall adopt appropriate measures to ensure that such a misuse and any resulting negative ramifications for research funding agencies, research participants, colleagues, students, and employees are avoided.

B) Rights of research participants

(1) Following the rules of (agricultural) economic and social scientific methods can entail adverse consequences or risks for specific individuals or groups. This is particularly the case with regard to research on and in non-democratic and conflict-afflicted countries and regions. When developing research designs and planning fieldwork trips, it is important that researchers weigh the potential gains of processing research question–related data and knowledge against the potential risks to research participants and other individuals/groups involved in the data collection process. Researchers should consider potential hazards not only for the short term (i.e. the duration of the field research period) but also for the longer term.

(2) Scholars should be aware that their research activities could potentially restrict or altogether close future access to a study population for their entire profession or related professions.

(3) In the field of (agricultural) economic and social science research, the personal rights of those involved in scientific studies are to be respected as is their right to freely choose whether to participate in such projects. Researchers should give this aspect special consideration when the individuals to be included in a study have a low level of education or social status or when they belong to an ethnic minority or marginalised group.

(4) In general, the decision to participate in a (agricultural) economic and social scientific study is a voluntary one based on sufficient information about the project's goals and methods. The principle of informed consent, however, cannot always be put into practice – for example, when the provision of comprehensive advance information could lead to distorted research results. In such cases it is highly recommended to reflect on such issues in Appendix A and B in order to justify the need to waive informed consent. It is understood that the degree and breadth of informed consent required will depend on the nature of the project.

(5) Researchers will avoid exposing people involved in their studies as interviewees, those observed, or otherwise (e.g. in connection with the evaluation of personal documents) to any foreseeable disadvantages or dangers associated with these individuals' participation. The anonymity of respondents and research participants is to be preserved unless they give their express consent to waive their right to anonymity. Such consent shall be registered verbally or in writing.

(6) As far as possible, researchers should foresee any potential violations of trust. Procedures which prevent identification of research participants should be used in all appropriate cases. Due to the electronic processing of data, particular attention should be paid to data access possibilities. Again, this requires precautionary measures to ensure that confidential information is protected. This applies in particular when crossing borders into countries and regions that are known for systematic data breaches. Hand-carried computer equipment and data storage devices should not contain any unencrypted sensitive data.

(7) Confidential information obtained from research participants must be handled accordingly; this obligation applies to all members of a research group (including interviewers, coders, assistants, typists, etc.) that have access to the data. It is the responsibility of the project manager to inform employees of this duty and to control access to confidential material.

(8) IAMO researchers should be encouraged to reflect on ways to reciprocate with research participants. This can, for example, include publishing short reports specifically for the people/groups that participated in the study or applying for funds to support cooperation with local partners (e.g. hiring local assistants) when formulating research proposals. Activities by IAMO researchers that aim to strengthen reciprocity are recognised as being part of the research process.

(9) In accordance with rules applicable to other professions, researchers are obligated to guarantee confidentiality and can exercise the right to refuse to testify if there is a concern that research participants will face (criminal) sanctions on the basis of information gained within the scope of their research.

C) Publications

(1) IAMO researchers name all those who contributed significantly to their research and their publications. The claims of authorship and the order of authors should reflect authors' participation in the research process and in the publication. Researchers must identify all data and materials that were borrowed (literally or in essence) from another author's published or unpublished work and acknowledge the author thereof. In addition, researchers must not knowingly omit references to thoughts that have been developed in other works.

(2) As publisher of several IAMO-series the institute is committed to fairly and promptly assessing submitted papers without personal or ideological prejudices. They notify authors of their decisions on submitted manuscripts in a timely manner.

(3) A publication commitment is binding. If publication has been assured, it should ensue as soon as possible.

D) Assessment

(1) IAMO employees are not permitted to assess people, manuscripts, funding applications, or other works if this draws them into a conflict of interest.

(2) Any work to be evaluated should be assessed thoroughly, carefully, confidentially, and within a reasonable period of time.

(3) Assessments that are related to personnel decisions will be treated as confidential by all parties. In such instances the matters of integrity, objectivity, and the avoidance of conflicts of interest are of the highest priority.

(4) IAMO employees who are asked to review books or manuscripts that they have already discussed elsewhere shall notify the requester about that fact. Furthermore, IAMO staff should refuse to review work in which they were directly or indirectly involved.

E) Working professionally with employees, colleagues, interns, and students

(1) In the course of their work IAMO employees will observe the IAMO rules related to good scientific practice and ethical issues.

(2) IAMO employees must endeavour to be objective and fair when hiring, laying off, evaluating, and promoting staff; determining staff salaries; dealing with other employment-related issues; and making vocational, recruitment, and co-optation decisions. They may not discriminate on the basis of age, sex, sexual orientation or identity, physical disability, social or regional origin, skin colour, ethnic or national origin, religion, or political beliefs.

(3) IAMO employees are not allowed to compel anyone (e.g. interviewees, research funding agencies, employees, interns, or students) to provide personal, gender-specific, or professional favours. In particular, every form of sexual harassment and sexual assault during work interactions is regarded as a serious ethical violation.

(4) IAMO employees that also hold teaching positions are obliged to provide their students with a good education given the importance and requirements of such roles.

2. REFLECTION ON ETHICAL ISSUES AND SECURING ETHICAL CLEARANCE

A) The Ethics Committee

(1) Composition and terms

1) The Ethics Committee consists of four members. To represent the various research themes and any related ethical issues, each academic department sends a member to the committee, elected by other researchers from his or her respective department for a period of three years. Additionally the representative for data security is a member of the Ethics Committee.
2) The committee elects a chairperson.
3) The committee meets when required or as desired.

(2) Tasks and responsibility

1) The Ethics Committee shall:
   a) examine the compatibility of proposed IAMO research projects with the IAMO Code of Research Ethics and, if compatibility has been attested to, give the respective project ethical clearance.
   b) advise the Executive Board and the KoFo on general ethical issues
   c) receive reports of any infringements of the IAMO Code of Research Ethics and strive for mediated settlements
   d) report on their work to IAMO researchers at least once a year.

B) Procedures

(1) The procedure for obtaining ethical clearance consists of two stages – though it is not always necessary to complete both stages.
(2) The first stage should already be completed during the application process or during a doctoral student's first half year of doctoral studies. At least one of the following possibilities has to be realised in order to guarantee a reflection process:
   1) Attending a workshop on basic ethical questions and project-specific issues
   2) Presenting a project introduction that entails a detailed discussion of the project's ethical implications at a research-team meeting
   3) Preparing a detailed discussion of the project's ethical implications within the project consortium
   4) Discussing in detail basic ethical questions and project-specific issues with one of the dissertation supervisors.
(3) The results of the first stage of the procedure will be recorded in the minutes for the Reflection on Research Ethics (see Appendix A), which will eventually be transferred over to the Ethics Committee. The second stage of the process begins on the basis of the recommendation for ethical clearance made in the Reflection on Research Ethics minutes or on the project leader's own initiative.
(4) The second stage of the procedure determines whether an ethical clearance certificate (see Appendix C) is obtained or not; it should be initiated at least two months before the project or the

fieldwork commences. For this purpose, the completed questionnaire (Appendix B) and the project proposal or dissertation synopsis must be submitted to the Ethics Committee with the request for a decision to be made.

(5) The questionnaire serves the committee as a basis for issuing the ethical clearance certificate or for formulating requirements.

(6) The committee may convene a meeting to which the applicants may be invited for further queries. In uncontroversial cases the decision to grant ethical clearance can be passed by way of circulation.

(7) In the event of a positive decision by the committee, an ethical clearance certificate (Appendix C) will be issued.

(8) With regard to the formulation of requirements, the implementation thereof will be checked in a time frame determined by the Ethics Committee. Should the committee find that the requirements have not been adequately met, it shall pass the case over to the IAMO Executive Board for further consideration.

3. APPENDIX

A) Reflection on Research Ethics – Meeting Minutes

Project manager:
Research project:
Meeting date:
Parties present:

Meeting topics:

(1) Will data on human subjects be collected during the course of the project?

☐ YES ☐ NO

(2) If yes,

1) does the project deal with particularly vulnerable groups (e.g. politically persecuted people, economically or educationally disadvantaged people, ethnic minorities, mentally disabled people, children, etc.)?

2) What are the possible risks for the research participants? (For example, the emergence of possible traumatisation in the subjects, the publication of results, or the unintentional dissemination of data used may result in, inter alia, criminal, civil, and/or political persecution, as well as adverse consequences for research participants' economic situations, employability, and/or reputations).

3) Which form of informed consent (verbal/written) will be used for the project? (Are there any possible restrictions?)

(3) For particularly high-risk projects, what alternative methods and designs have been considered?

(4) What thoughts have been given to guaranteeing the anonymity of research participants? What precautions will be taken to avoid foreseeable risks in the event of an inadvertent disclosure of personal data?

(5) Have any measures (e.g. publication of results in local languages, providing research subjects with their own reports, funds for cooperating with local partners) been taken to promote reciprocity with the research participants? If so, what?

(6) What agreements on authorship are in place with regard to publications resulting from the project?

Recommendation of the RD Speaker / Head of Department / supervisor / workshop leader:

Ethical clearance from the IAMO Ethics Committee

☐ a) must be obtained
☐ b) is voluntary but recommended
☐ c) is not required, as the project does not raise any research ethics issues

for the RP RD Head Speaker / RT speakerHead of Department / supervisor / workshop leader:

Date/Signature

for the project leader:

With regard to the recommendation of the RP Head / RT speaker / supervisor / workshop leader:

- ☐ a) I agree
- ☐ b) I do not agree

Date/Signature

B) Ethical Clearance Questionnaire

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO)
Research Ethics Form
PLEASE TAKE NOTE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- **All sections** of this form must be completed by the applicant for circulation to the IAMO Research Ethics Committee.
- Please consult the IAMO Code of Research Ethics before completing this form.
- Please use this form as an opportunity to reflect on the potentially damaging effects your research could have on participants.
- Ethical approval is not contingent on answering the questions here in one specific way; this is because different research projects will require researchers to deal with research participants in different ways. For instance, some projects are not feasible if participants are fully informed about the research objectives. If this is the case for your project, ethical approval is still possible provided that a detailed explanation is given as to why this is the case and why other research methods are not viable.
- Application for ethical approval is *mandatory* if so decided by the funding agency, your Research Domain Speaker, Projekt Team Leader, supervisor, or workshop leader (see Reflection on Research Ethics minutes). IAMO researchers are also encouraged to apply for ethical clearance on a voluntary basis.

Application for Ethical Approval of a Research Project

Part I – Personal information form
(1) Title of the study
(2) Applicant(s)
(3) Contact details of primary applicant

Part II – Detailed information
(1) Briefly describe the purpose of the research. (Please attach any detailed research proposal if submitted or to be submitted for grant application.)

(2) Data collection methods. How are you planning to collect data? (Please attach interview schedules, questionnaires, guidelines, etc. to this application.) Please provide details about your data collection methods and their ethical implications.

- ☐ 1) Interviews
- ☐ 2) Questionnaire
- ☐ 3) Experiment
- ☐ 4) Secondary data
- ☐ 5) Observation
- ☐ 6) Other (please specify)

(3) Characteristics of participants:

1) Age range
2) Gender
3) Ethnicity
4) Location
5) Socio-economic status
6) Other characteristics indicating increased vulnerability

(*If your sample includes children (those aged 18 and below), please describe how and by whom permission will be granted? If you are planning to include children without parental consent, please explain why you decided to do so and/or why you believe that their parents would give consent if it were possible to contact them.)*

(4) Consent. What type of consent will be obtained from your research participants?

- ☐ 1) Verbal (if you are making use of verbal consent, please explain why written consent is not an option)
- ☐ 2) Written
- ☐ 3) Anonymous questionnaire (covering letter required, no consent form needed)
- ☐ 4) Other (please specify)

(5) Participant information. What will participants be told about the study? What information about the research procedure or the purposes of the investigation will be withheld and (if anything) why?

(6) Risk to Participants. Does the proposed research pose any foreseeable physical, psychological, social, legal, economic, or other risks to the research participants – either immediately or in the long run?

☐ YES ☐ NO

1) If yes, please answer the following questions:
   a) In detail, what is the nature and extent of the risk(s)?

   b) What alternative approaches were or will be considered? Why might these alternatives not be feasible for your study?

   c) Do you feel that the value of the information to be gained outweighs the risks? If so, why?

(7) Data confidentiality. What precautions will be taken to safeguard the identifiable records of participants? Please describe the specific procedures to be used by yourself and others to ensure data confidentiality in both the short and long run. This question also applies to those researchers using non-anonymised secondary data sources.

(8) Authorship agreement. What authorship agreement have you reached with your co-researchers or supervisor?

☐ 1) Non-publication of research
☐ 2) Standard authorship agreement (i.e. principal researcher is first author; co-researcher(s) and supervisor(s) is/are co-authors)
☐ 3) Customised agreement (please specify below)

(9) Reciprocity. Have you envisaged any measures that will enhance reciprocity with research participants – to occur either during the research process or when your research is published/disseminated?

Date/Signature

CHECKLIST OF THINGS TO ENCLOSE WITH YOUR APPLICATION

Please note that this list only specifies the essential documents required for your application to be considered by the Ethics Committee. Please attach any further documentation that you think might help to support your application.

- Research proposal
- Interview schedules and questionnaires (if applicable)
- Participant information sheet

Ethical Clearance Certificate

Certificate reference number:
Project title:
Nature of project: Dissertation / research project
Principal researcher(s):
Supervisor:
Co-supervisor:

On behalf of the Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO) we hereby give ethical approval in respect of the undertakings contained in the above-mentioned project and research instrument(s). Should any other instrument(s) be used, separate authorisation will be required. The researcher may therefore commence with the research as from the date of this certificate, using the reference number indicated above.
Please note that IAMO must be informed immediately of:

- any material change in the conditions or undertakings mentioned in the document
- any material breaches of the ethical undertakings or events that impact the ethical conduct of the research.

IAMO retains the right to withdraw or amend this ethical clearance certificate if:

- any unethical principal or practices are revealed or suspected
- relevant information has been withheld or misrepresented
- regulatory changes of any nature so require
- the conditions contained in the certificate have not been adhered to.

The Ethics Committee wishes you well in your research.

Yours sincerely,

_____

Date:

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development
in Transition Economies