



INFORMATION SHEET: ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR POST-DISASTER RESEARCH

Research activity in disaster-impacted regions incurs ethical risk

After disasters, people converge into the impacted area to support response and recovery, and to conduct research. Their presence and activities, however, risk putting pressure on scarce resources and interfering with response operations. Interactions with community members can exacerbate stress (IAVCEI 1999; Citraningtyas 2010).

Researcher convergence, and the effects of the disaster, mean **that all research activity in disaster zones, irrespective of discipline, carries heightened ethical risk**. The field of ethics concerns the way people relate to others, and the identification of ethical 'bottom lines.' Decisions and actions, for example, should not benefit the decider/actor at the expense of others, increase harm to others, or violate human rights (Werhane 1999).

After disasters, defer data-gathering, unless in support of the response operation

As a rule, data gathering should be deferred during response. Researchers should refrain from entering or engaging with impacted communities, unless formally required to do so in support of the response. Researchers supporting the response should take measures to minimise pressure on scarce resources, demands on local officials, and stress among locals as a result of their research activities.

Guidelines for human interaction when conducting research

The Belmont Report provides **three ethical principles or bottom lines designed to minimise the risk of harm** to human research subjects. This makes them useful for researchers from all disciplines gathering data in disaster zones, where research activity has the potential to increase harm to disaster-affected individuals and communities.

(Belmont Report 1979)

1. **The RESPECT FOR PERSONS/INFORMED CONSENT principle:** Requires that people are considered capable of making informed decisions. People have the fundamental human right to be **fully informed about research** that carries any risk to them, and they have the **right to refuse** to be involved.

After disasters, RESPECT and prioritise the needs of locals and the response operation

- **Inform response agencies** about data gathering activity
- **Wear and carry clear identification** – include name, organisation and contact details
- **Before gathering data** on private property
 - **Contact the owner, inform them** (what data, how will it be gathered, what will it be used for, potential risks to owner)
 - **Request consent to gather data**
- **Respect / defer to the wishes of officials and owners** – 'take no for an answer.'
- **Record interactions with officials / owners**, including written consent to gather data

2. **The BENEFICENCE principle:** Requires that **research does no harm and provides benefits** to those it directly impacts.

After disasters, ensure human interactions DO NOT INADVERTENTLY INCREASE HARM

- **Clearly communicate identified sources of risk to officials**
- **Ensure interactions do not increase stress;** be sensitive to local emotions and needs
- **Ensure interactions do not undermine the response;** refer locals seeking information to relevant officials
- **Restrain enthusiasm for data;** it can seem insensitive
- **Avoid creating unnecessary anxiety** by speculating to locals

After disasters, PROVIDE RESEARCH BENEFITS to impacted communities and officials

- **Make data available for response purposes**
- **Ensure that data gathered on private property remains available to the owner** (it belongs to them under NZ law)
- **Support officials with advice**, if they request it

3. **The DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE principle:** Requires the **fair distribution of research burdens and benefits**. 'Unjust' social patterns should not be exacerbated by additional research burdens. One social group should not carry the burden of research that benefits another group. Populations should not incur a research burden just because of their situation.

After disasters, minimise the footprint & impact of data gathering

- **Coordinate research activity, and share data**, to minimise researcher numbers/activities in the disaster impacted area
- **Ensure research teams are resource-independent** (food/water/tents/fuel etc); do not increase pressure on scarce local resources.



INFORMATION SHEET: ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR POST-DISASTER RESEARCH

Selected references

- The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.* (1979). Washington, D.C.
- Beaven, S., Wilson, T., Johnston, L., Johnston, D., & Smith, R. (2016). Research engagement after disasters: research coordination before, during, and after the 2011–2012 Canterbury earthquake sequence, New Zealand. *Earthquake Spectra*, 32(2), 713-735.
- Browne, K. E., & Peek, L. (2014). Beyond the IRB: An ethical toolkit for long-term disaster research. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters*, 32(1), 82-120.
- Citraringtyas, T., MacDonald, E., & Herrman, (2010). A Second Tsunami? The Ethics of Coming into Communities following Disaster. *Asian Bioethics Review*, 2(2), 108–123.
- Gaillard, J. C., & Peek, L. (2019). Disaster-zone research needs a code of conduct. *Nature*, 575(7783), 440-442.
- IAVCEI Subcommittee for Crisis Protocols (Newhall C, Aramaki S, Barberi F, Blong R, Calvache M, Cheminee J-L, Punongbayan R, Siebe C, Simkin T, Sparks RSJ, Tjetjep W) (1999) Professional conduct of scientists during volcanic crises. *Bull Volcanol* 60:323– 334
- Werhane, P. H. (1991). Engineers and management: The challenge of the challenger incident. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(8), 605–616

Other relevant ethical guidelines

IPENZ Code of Ethical Conduct: <https://www.engineeringnz.org/engineer-tools/ethics-rules-standards/code-ethical-conduct/>

GEER ethics protocol: http://www.geerassociation.org/media/files/Important%20Docs/GEER_Ethics_Protocol.pdf

IAVCEI Task Group (2016) Toward IAVCEI guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of scientists involved in volcanic hazard evaluation, risk mitigation, and crisis response. *Bull Volcanol* (2016) 78: 31

Royal Society of New Zealand guidelines for ethical research conduct: <http://www.royalsociety.org.nz/organisation/about/code>

Royal Society of New Zealand guidelines for public engagement. <http://www.royalsociety.org.nz/research-practice/public-engagement-guidelines>

Health Research Council (HRC) Te Ara Tika / Māori Research Ethics Framework: <https://www.hrc.govt.nz/resources/te-ara-tika-guidelines-maori-research-ethics-0>

Health Research Council (HRC) Pacific Health Research guidelines: https://gateway.hrc.govt.nz/funding/downloads/Pacific_health_research_guidelines.pdf

National Ethics Advisory Committee (NEAC) Guidelines <https://neac.health.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/NEAC/publications/national-ethical-standards-health-disability-research-quality-improvement-2019-v3.pdf>

This information sheet updates guidelines first produced for researchers involved in assessing the impacts of the Kaikōura Earthquake 2016 in Aotearoa NZ (and endorsed by Resilience to Nature's Challenges, QuakeCoRE and Natural Hazards Platform research programs).

The 2016 guidelines were peer reviewed by experienced disaster researchers, and the Chair of the UC Human Research Ethics Committee.

Thanks to Christine Kenney, Professor of Disaster Risk Reduction (Massey University) and member of the Ministerial Advisory Committee for Emergency Management, and to Dean Sutherland, Chair of the UC Human Research Ethics Committee, for reviewing the 2023 guidelines.

Contact: sarah.beaven@canterbury.ac.nz