The Production and Reproduction of SOCIAL INEQUALITIES

Code of Conduct

FOR THE RESEARCH UNIT "THE PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION OF SOCIAL INEQUALITIES: GLOBAL CONTEXTS AND CONCEPTS OF LABOR EXPLOITATION"

MERON Z. ERESSO
TU HUYNH
FABIANA KUTSCHE
MICHAELA PELICAN
ULRIKE WESCH

January 2021

This Research Unit is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation.

VolkswagenStiftung

CONTENT

SECTION I – BACKGROUND

1.1 Concise Description of the Research Unit

The research unit "The Production and Reproduction of Social Inequalities: Global Contexts and Concepts of Exploitative Labour" is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation in the funding line "Global Issues – Integrating Different Perspectives on Social Inequality". It will run over a period of four years, starting from 01.01.2021.

The research unit focuses on understanding the overarching question of why attempts aimed at increasing equality often contributed to generating more durable inequalities[1]. As a way of addressing this general question, the research unit focuses on concepts and actors as well as their roles in producing and reproducing social inequalities in the context of colonial and postcolonial labour systems and regimes of mobility in the "Global South". In the projects of the research unit, inequalities are understood as relational and historically embedded and as comprising several dimensions, including social, economic and epistemic inequality.

More specifically, the research unit members focus on selected concepts that are locally grounded and describe forms of social inequalities linked to different types of labour exploitation, namely "native labour", "new slavery", "human trafficking", and "cheap/abundant labour". The team members investigate – both from a historical and contemporary perspective – how these concepts circulated on a global scale and were negotiated, translated and adapted by institutional as well as individual actors with the aim of challenging social inequalities, while eventually contributing to the production of those same or new inequalities. The projects intend to reconcile debates on conceptual history, labour history and inequality as well as combine perspectives from both South and North. Ultimately, they aim to interpret global labour regimes and to draw lessons from experiences for societies in both the "Global South" and the "Global North". The research unit contains the following five research projects including one special project on COVID-19, each headed by one or more Principal Investigator(s) (PI):

[1] For more information about the research unit please visit the official website on https://socialinequalities.uni-koeln.de/.

- From global standards to unequal treatment: The ILO and the concept of “native labour” (Prof. Dr. Ulrike Linder, University of Cologne)
- Chinese indentured labour as “new slavery”: Perspectives from South Africa and China (Prof. Dr. Tu Huynh, Jinan University, Guangzhou)
- Debates on “trafficking in persons and slavery” in Cameroon (Prof. Dr. Michaela Pelican, University of Cologne)
- “Development” fostering social inequality?: A study on labor arrangements in Ethiopia’s manufacturing sector (Prof. Dr. Meron Zeleke Eresso, Addis Ababa University)
- Communication during and after COVID-19: (Re)producing social inequalities and/or opportunities among African migrants in the United Arab Emirates and China (Prof. Dr. Tu Huynh, Jinan University, Guangzhou; Dr. Jonathan Ngeh, Global South Studies Center, University of Cologne; Prof. Dr. Michaela Pelican, University of Cologne).

The research unit is headed by one of the PIs, Professor Michaela Pelican, who represents the research unit to the Volkswagen Foundation and to the outside.

1.2 Aim and Scope of the Code of Conduct

Given the specific nature of the research unit, comprising five autonomous projects with scholars from different disciplinary and geographical backgrounds sharing one overarching research agenda, this code of conduct is tailored to its specific multidisciplinary and multisited qualities. The objective of this research unit code of conduct is, hence, to have a shared understanding among members on the roles, rights and duties of all parties involved, i.e. the principal investigators (PIs), the junior researchers in each project (e.g., Postdoc/doctoral/MA researchers, research assistants and research collaborators/community partners) and the administrative coordinator. As such, it envisages to develop agreed upon ethical standards that promote good research and a symmetric collegial relationship across projects. Hence, the guidelines help as a partnership management tool for developing a mutually respectful and fair collaboration of project partners from diverse disciplinary and geographical backgrounds. This document will go through periodic revision on an annual basis.

SECTION II – RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF PROJECT MEMBERS

This section briefly presents the rights and duties of respective project members and covers themes, such as the mandate, rights and duties of the principal investigators of projects as well as those of the project members.

2.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Principle Investigators (PI)

- The PI of a project is the primary individual responsible for the realization and administration of the respective project. The PI is the person leading the project with due compliance with applicable regulations and the institutional policy of the Volkswagen Foundation, the PI's home institution and the University of Cologne.
- All of the PIs are administratively autonomous in managing their respective research projects by complying with all institutional policies, practices and procedures of the funding institution, the PI's home institution and the University of Cologne, which as the research unit's lead institution is directly accountable to the Volkswagen Foundation.
- The PI is responsible for fiscal and administrative management of the respective project.
- The PI is responsible for regularly monitoring expenditures to ensure that funds are in compliance with the funder's terms and conditions and are only expended to directly support and benefit the project.
- The PI is in charge of managing possible project risks with due foresight and of reviewing and securing approval for any revisions on the project scope or other activities that may require prior approval from the funder. This should be communicated and coordinated with the coordination team (Michaela Pelican and Ulrike Wesch) at the University of Cologne.
- The PI oversees all research-related activities of the respective project and fosters a culture of research integrity.
- The PI is responsible to ensure the availability of appropriate resources for research and academic activities to be conducted by the PI and other project members (i.e., the researchers and research collaborators/community partners) involved. This should adhere to the approved budgetary items stated in the grant letter.

- The PI is responsible to call for funding of budgeted and approved activities in a timely manner in order to give the administrative staffs in Cologne enough time to review the application and transfer the funds.
- The PI is expected to account for all the funds transferred in a timely manner once in a year.
- The PI is responsible for submission of the annual financial and research progress reports in a timely manner, based on the reporting templates to be received from the coordinator's office at the University of Cologne.
- All of the PIs are intellectually autonomous and accountable only in terms of delivering the research outcomes (e.g., publications) promised. They are also required to contribute to the yearly progress report of the research unit, which will be compiled by the coordinator's office at the University of Cologne to be submitted to the Volkswagen Foundation.
- The PI is mindful that the relationship between project members is collegial. Understanding the inherent asymmetrical relationship between supervisor and PhD candidates/graduate students and of the responsibilities of mentorship, the PI needs to also be mindful that the relationship should encompass mutual respect, avoiding exploitation and violation of rights of those under their supervision.
- The PI oversees the mentoring of junior project members, postdoctoral/doctoral researchers and graduate students.
- The PI is responsible to obtain local research clearance in places where it is required.
- The PI makes sure to protect the rights, safety and welfare of subjects involved in the research, including researchers and the study community.
- The PI is responsible to ensure that all project members are mindful of the sensitive nature of the unit's research topics in their communication with the public and interested colleagues.

2.2 Roles and Responsibilities of Researchers and Research Collaborators/ Community Partners

- The researchers and research collaborators/community partners are free to conduct their individual research subprojects without the interference of the PI and other project members once they have been approved.

- The researchers and research collaborators/community partners contribute to the overarching research unit's shared research goals (i.e., the respective project they are part of) in a collaborative manner.
- The researchers and research collaborators/community partners are considerate of potential research-related conflicts of interest and, hence, need to adhere to the ethical conditions stated in the code of conduct.
- The researchers are expected to submit their calls for funding in a timely manner in order to allow the PI and administrative staffs enough time to review the request and process the transaction.
- The researchers and research collaborators/community partners ensure the accuracy and submission of all required reports throughout the duration of the fellowship or partnership.
- The researchers and research collaborators/community partners are expected to report to the PI in a timely manner, as stated in their respective employment agreement or grant letter.

SECTION III – RESEARCH ETHICAL CODES AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY

In line with the guidelines of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) for "Safeguarding Good Research Practice" and "The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity" of the All European Academies (ALLEA), fostering a culture of research integrity that informs every aspect of the team's research activities also entails updating knowledge about the standards of good research practice and the current state of the art on a regular basis. Project PIs, who occupy mentoring roles, are responsible for ensuring that every member of their team receives training and understands guidelines to properly develop, design and structure research activities.

The members of the research unit, who will conduct empirical, ethnographic research, will draw on the ethical review guidelines developed by the German Anthropological Association (DGSKA) as well as the ethical review guidelines developed by professional associations and/or research institutions in the regions where their respective research will take place. The research unit members acknowledge the fact that ethical challenges and possible strategies to address them can differ (significantly) by region. The unit, therefore, does not strive for a uniform approach that applies to all projects, but provides room for each project to assess the

relevant ethical issues and develop possible ways of dealing with them. All project members should participate in this process, as research ethics and methodology are part and parcel of anthropological, sociological and historical training and mentoring. Moreover, exchanging ideas within and across projects about research ethics and methodology (in addition to thematic research findings) will be an important source of mutual learning and knowledge integration.

In line with the DGSKA, the project members support the idea of constant critical reflection of professional practice. Project members are encouraged to go through the ethical review process outlined by the DGSKA. Further steps include engaging in peer-to-peer and mentoring discussions with research unit members or experienced colleagues in order to identify the project's specific challenges and ethical risks (for both research participants and researchers) as well as finding adequate ways of dealing with them. The DGSKA provides two forms (i.e., a reflection sheet and risk assessment sheet) that can be completed and discussed for this purpose[2].

Regarding the appropriate handling of anthropological research data, the research unit members take inspiration from the current position paper of the DGSKA[3], which argues that, as a general rule, anthropological data (e.g., fieldnotes) cannot be freely made available because of their personal and co-authored nature (i.e., co-produced with research participants). The research unit members are encouraged to take a similar approach as in the case of research ethics outlined above – i.e., to aim at the safe and long-term storage of research data on the platform that the respective PI and project members consider safe and reliable in the specific context (e.g., in the institutional storage space, SOFs, provided by the University of Cologne), while at the same time critically reflecting on the risks and regulations that apply to the different research sites and the PI's host institutions.

Those project members who use archival sources are encouraged to work within the usual methodological framework of the humanities and, furthermore, follow the outlines of academic honesty and responsibility.

---

[2] GAA (n. d.). Basic Principles and Procedures for the Ethical Review of Anthropological Research ["Ethical Guidelines"], in: GAA <https://en.dgska.de/ethics/> (15.12.2020).
[3] GAA (2019). Position Paper on the Handling of Anthropological Research Data, in: GAA <https://www.dgska.de/dgska/forschungsdatenmanagement/> (15.12.2020).

Research integrity is one of the key ethical issues, whereby project members are expected to conduct their respective research in a responsible and honest way. This will allow others to have confidence and trust in the methods used, the findings of the research and the analysis. Drawing on the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, the four pillars of research integrity for the research unit include reliability, honesty, respect and accountability. The principle of reliability focuses on ensuring the quality of research throughout the process of designing the research, the methodology, the analysis and the use of resources. The principle of honesty is crucial to the process of developing, undertaking, reviewing, reporting and communicating research in a transparent, fair, full and unbiased way. On the third principle of respect, project members are expected to respect colleagues, research participants, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage and the environment. Furthermore, project members have to duly follow the principle of accountability for the research from idea to publication; for its management and organization; for training, supervision and mentoring as well as for its wider impacts[4].

SECTION IV – COORDINATION TEAM OF THE RESEARCH UNIT

The research unit comprises of five autonomous research projects, working collaboratively and each being headed by one or more PI(s). One among the PIs acts as the coordinator and speaker of the research unit, who has to be based at a German university, as mandated by the Volkswagen Foundation. The title of this position is speaker/head of the research unit. This position is held by Michaela Pelican, based at the University of Cologne and selected and confirmed by all of the PIs. In this capacity, she is in charge of the management of the research unit and the official communication with the Volkswagen Foundation. She also represents the research unit to the outside. At the same time, representational requests will be discussed among research unit members, and where possible, tasks will be shared (e.g., by sharing ideas or information, participating in the activities or taking turns in representing the research unit).

Michaela Pelican is assisted by Ulrike Wesch, who is in charge of organizational and administrative aspects of the research unit and public outreach. These include the

[4] ALLEA (2017). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Revised Edition. ALLEA: Berlin.

research unit's financial accounting and reporting to the Volkswagen Foundation, assistance with contractual arrangements between partner universities, organization of workshops and other activities of the research unit, facilitation of research activities and travels of project members and guests as well as maintenance of the unit's communication infrastructure (e.g., Trello, Sciebo and SOFs platforms for data transfer and storage at the University of Cologne) and public outreach platforms (e.g., website https://socialinequalities.uni-koeln.de/). The title of her position is administrative coordinator of the research unit.

The goal of the research unit is to establish symmetrical, horizontal, equal exchange and collaboration between all research members, both across and within project teams. However, the logic of project management and the funder's administrative requirements favour asymmetrical, vertical and unequal structures and place constraints on the structure of the research unit. Reconciling these opposing principles poses challenges to the PIs and the coordination team. As such, measures are introduced to ensure a sense of symmetry among the members of the research unit. The measures include monthly meetings to facilitate timely and open communication between all members of the research unit, share information on the activities of members and the coordination team, develop joint strategies and address upcoming needs.

To enable the smooth functioning of the research unit's coordination and administration, the PIs, located at different institutions, are all affiliated with the Global South Studies Center (GSSC) at the University of Cologne. This was requested by the PIs and approved by the Volkswagen Foundation. Furthermore, the PIs and researchers are integrated in the coordination and administration process as well as agree to comply with the guidelines outlined in Sections II and V of the code of conduct. The purpose of integration into the coordination and administration process is to enable Ulrike Wesch to effectively fulfil her role; this process involves:

(1) All members of the research unit agree to engage in open and timely communication with the coordination team. This is especially important when sharing responsibilities for tasks that concern the whole research unit.
(2) All members of the research unit agree to comply with administrative guidelines of the Volkswagen Foundation and, where applicable, with the administrative guidelines of the University of Cologne as the institution in charge of the

administration of the research unit. The respective guidelines and documents are available to all members of the research unit on the internal communication platform (Sciebo).

(3) Each project PI agrees to provide yearly finance and research progress reports. The templates for annual financial and research progress reports are uploaded on our internal communication platform (Sciebo). On the basis of these individual reports, the coordination team shall compile the research unit's yearly report to be submitted to the Volkswagen Foundation.

(4) Each project PI is responsible to ensure that all project members (including researchers and research collaborators/community partners) are mindful of the sensitive nature of the unit's research topics in their communication with the public and interested colleagues. The guidelines for public outreach activities are uploaded on our internal communication platform (Sciebo).

Risk assessment and risk management are part and parcel of project management. The research unit's coordination is further compounded by the task of effective risk management as a result of its transnational nature. What this means is that each project is dealing with locally specific challenges that require tailor-made and context-specific solutions. Examples of challenges not only include politically volatile and censorial environments, such as in Ethiopia and China, where two of the PIs are based, but also potential bureaucratic hurdles (e.g., in regard to contractual arrangements between universities). The PIs and coordination team jointly share the responsibility to effectively assess and manage project risks. The principles outlined in Section V, such as timely and honest communication, mutual trust, the willingness to support each other and joint strategizing, form the basis for developing adequate solutions.

SECTION V – COLLABORATION WITHIN THE RESEARCH UNIT AND MULTI-PARTNERS[5]

This section defines the nature of collaboration among researchers within a project and between projects. It further suggests ideas for creating and maintaining a

[5] Ideas for this section draw from Dietrich, P. et al. (2010). The role of project collaboration quality and knowledge: integration capability in multi-partner projects. Paper presented at PMI Research Conference: Defining the Future of Project Management, Washington, DC. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.

productive collaborative relationship. This is especially important given the different disciplinary, geographical and cultural differences among our research team members.

5.1 What Does Collaboration Mean and Entail?

Collaboration is a process whereby people, representing themselves or institutions, work together to achieve a common goal or set of intersecting goals and to gain mutual benefits by sharing knowledge, learning and building consensus. As a process, those involved, regardless of whom they represent, necessarily create relationships. The nature of a relationship may vary, depending on the degree of its strength. Essential to relations that operate in a truly collaborative mode to achieve common goal/intersecting goals or to gain mutual benefits are trust and commitment (Dietrich et al. 2010).

While having common and/or intersecting goals is an important factor contributing to the quality of collaboration, trust and commitment of every research unit member (not just the PIs) play equally significant roles shaping the texture of the collaborative process**.** Trust – that is, being reliable and carrying through with actions that are congruent with one's words **–** affects collaboration quality in terms of communication behaviour, cohesion and creation of an ethical environment that guides decisions and actions of members. It is a central component of relationships. Equally important, commitment sets the tone for members' interests to participate, engage in mutual support and coordination and set their priorities to favour the tasks they agree to undertake. It provides for positive problem-solving mechanisms when conflicts emerge.

To accomplish a multi-partner project such as this one, every member of the research unit should be willing and able to share knowledge. Integration of knowledge possessed by each member, from diverse academic disciplines and with access to different resources that reflect the individual's geographical positionality, is an essential part of the project work. As such, knowledge integration capability – that is, turning knowledge into action to co-create value – is a significant aspect of collaboration in the project context.

5.2 Suggestions for Collaboration Quality

As mentioned above, trust is fundamental to the collaborative process. While trust can be gained when members carry through their word or intention with action, transparency – that is, the disclosure or sharing of relevant information – occupies a crucial role in generating and maintaining trust. Though transparency is an integral part of the collaborative process, the research unit also recognizes that there is certain information that members do not have the right to know, as it infringes on personal privacy.

In addition to transparency, other identified mechanisms to strengthen the quality of collaboration include communication, coordination, mutual support, shared expectations and cohesion. These elements are elaborated below:

- Given the geographical spread of members that limit in-person meetings, communication entails the exchange of information between individuals through several online communication media, such as email, Zoom and Trello. While members within and across projects should ensure that the frequency of communication is high and efficient enough in order to keep all members informed of any changes, it is important to consider conditions that might impede the timeliness of communication, such as differences in time zones and internet connectivity issues in certain parts of the world. The quality of communication in a collaborative setting reflects the ability of members to share their ideas openly. To ensure open communication in the collaborative process, the research unit encourages developing a symmetrical relationship between every member.
- Though the research unit has a coordination team to facilitate the collaborative process, coordination within and across projects needs to be a joint effort that involves all members. Coordination facilitates fluid interactions between all members, ensuring harmony and synchronicity of co-actions. The point of coordination is to be efficient, but not rigid, and is, thus, adjusted to knowledge and information sharing needs of each situation. To work together effectively within and across projects, coordination entails a clear understanding of the goals, related activities, interdependencies between the activities and contributions to be made by each member. The strength of coordination is intimately connected to communication.

- Equally integral to a productive collaborative relationship is the existence of mutual support from all members. Mutual support manifests in members' willingness to help each other in solving problems that emerge during the research process as well as in achieving commonly agreed goals. Similar to coordination, mutual support benefits from members' flexibility with their assistance in the case of unforeseen incidents and ability to compromise to the needs of each situation.
- As intimated under mutual support, shared expectations on the behaviour of each member also influence the quality of collaboration**.** Shared expectations refer to the alignment between contributions provided by each member with the expectations of the contributions. Alignment between each member's priorities in collaboration (e.g., career development or resource usage) and commonly agreed priorities of the research team through open communication can help to prevent disappointments and conflicts. As such, PIs, equipped with inputs from researchers, should clearly define and emphasize the overall research team's priorities/goals to develop shared expectations on behaviour and to increase the predictability of the behaviour of all members. A productive collaborative relationship requires that every member accepts and respects the shared expectations concerning required efforts.
- Finally, the strength of collaboration is defined by cohesion or the existence of a collaborative spirit between members within and across projects. This spirit underpins the feeling of collegiality, strengthens the nature of a collaborative relationship and nurtures open sharing of information and knowledge as well as willingness to participate in mutual support. That cohesion is crucial in determining a member's willingness to engage in and the degree of collaboration, the above qualities reinforce cohesiveness.

5.3 Collaboration Leading to Knowledge Integration

As already mentioned, an essential part of working collaboratively between partners also involves integration of knowledge possessed by every member. It can be the core or incentive of collaboration. Knowledge integration is an ongoing interactive process that draws on the ability of research unit members to turn knowledge into action. This relationship potentially enables the team to be innovative in addressing knowledge gaps within and across projects, incorporate areas of research that extend the Global South scope of the overall research unit and overcome resource

scarcity in the project process (e.g., extend networks for information dissemination, share information technology, etc.). What follows are ideas for turning knowledge into action to co-create value:

- Similar to knowledge creation that is enabled by activities that encourage discussion, feedback, brainstorming and benchmarking, knowledge integration is made possible through the processes and activities of synthesizing, refinement and restructuring of knowledge as well as coordination and distribution. To facilitate these, the project organization culture is central to encourage interaction and knowledge flow between members as well as support individuals to self-organize their own knowledge and participate in communities of practice. Both can potentially augment participation in knowledge sharing and problem solving within and across projects.
- Annual workshops or conferences that bring members of all five projects together are important platforms for knowledge integration. Additionally, monthly meetings involving members of individual projects can also have this effect. These gatherings require coordination and distribution of tasks that members can undertake. They are also platforms for synthesizing and/or refining ideas related to individual projects.
- Quarterly discussions of members' progress or co-evaluation of projects provide a platform for members across projects to make suggestions for improving workflows, overcoming obstacles from fieldwork and/or synthesizing or refining research findings. Importantly, this platform creates space for mutual and symmetrical learning and co-thinking across projects.
- Through the rotation of organizational tasks (e.g., note taking during meetings and uploading information to Trello) that are beyond the scope of the coordination team and individual projects, PIs not only potentially contribute towards the creation and maintenance of a symmetrical relationship, but also towards the development of different kinds of skills and knowledge of each member.
- Transferring knowledge is crucial to knowledge integration. In addition to the above activities, mentoring, training and information technology (e.g., email, digital repositories/storage for collected data, online organizational applications and virtual conferencing tools) provide platforms for knowledge transfer. Information technology is not only an open and efficient way of informing or sharing with each other as necessary, but also to facilitate good and efficient knowledge flow within and across projects.

SECTION VI – AUTHORSHIP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This section addresses two types of authorship: (1) authorship among researchers within a project and (2) authorship that includes members of the researched community as collaborators or research collaborators (henceforth, community partners). Guidelines concerning to the first type of authorship are considered relevant to researchers co-authoring across projects. As for the second type of authorship, it is not only important for the entire research team to be aware of the community partners' roles and contributions to a project, but also for these to be appropriately acknowledged and reflected in the resulting publications (on academic platforms and beyond). Accordingly, the purpose of this section is to help ensure that an individual's intellectual contributions to the research result/output receive proper credit, which makes the individual responsible and accountable for the work. It further aims to help shape meaningful and respectful collaboration in research.

6.1 Who Is an Author?

An author is a person who translates research findings into knowledge. The person does this by participating in the idea stage and/or making a substantial contribution to the writing that includes finalizing the responses to reviewers. Equally important, an author agrees to be accountable for the work.

The PI of a project is encouraged to discuss the possibilities and responsibilities connected with authorship and acknowledgement with researchers and community partners at the outset and throughout the project, especially when a new researcher or community partner joins the team. Doing this can help to clarify concepts, publication process and expectations for all team members.

6.2 Authorship Among Researchers Within and Across Projects[6]

- The responsibility for decisions regarding the authorship of a publication lies with those who carried out the research work reported in the publication. Research

[6] McNutt, Marcia K. et al. (2018). Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication, in: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(11), pp. 2557-2560 and DFG (2019): Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice. Code of Conduct. DFG: Bonn.

work can include the development and design of the research project, the collection of data and sources as well as the analysis and interpretation of data.

- A person recognised as an author further needs to be included in drafting the manuscript, critically revising the intellectual content and approving the final version to be submitted for publication. In the event that the manuscript is returned for revision, all persons identified as authors are responsible for reviewing and approving all changes prior to the manuscript's resubmission. Except for the last-mentioned item, all else are relevant to online blogs.
- Where there are multiple authors, the sequence of authorship should be discussed and agreed upon by all authors. Depending on the discipline and institutional practice, different standards may apply (e.g., alphabetical sequence, sequence according to the substance of each author's contribution or primacy of first and last author in the natural sciences).
- The publication culture of authors' home institutions may influence the willingness to participate in co-authorship or the choice of publication outlets (e.g., requirements to publish a certain number of first-authored articles in peer-reviewed journals of a particular index for promotion).
- Co-authorship between PIs and researchers in a tutoring relationship (e.g., between supervisors and PhD candidates/MA students before the latter have attained their degree) should be considered carefully for possible career implications. Different practices or standards may apply to different disciplines and should be discussed between the potential co-authors early on to avoid misunderstandings.
- All authors share responsibility for the collective research published. They must ensure that original data and sources upon which the submission is based are preserved following best practices in the field, confirm that the data and source presentation accurately reflects the original and, also, have to minimise obstacles to the sharing of all materials described in the work. Authors may not refuse to give consent to the publication of the results without sufficient reasons and verifiable criticism.

6.3 Authorship with Research Collaborators/Community Partners[7]

The requirements are similar to 6.2, but with modifications to account for differences between community partners and researchers. Irrespective of differences, there are ways for community partners to make substantial contributions that qualify them for authorship even though they might not be involved in all aspects of the research process from start to end.

- Community partners can be involved in a research project from the start, as in the conception of a research idea, or can subsequently contribute to the research design and its execution. The latter may include, but is not limited to, developing or selecting fieldwork methods, recruiting sources, interpreting results and sharing results. Community partners, who are not trained in scientific methodologies, data analysis or interpretation, can still make substantial contributions through their conversations with research team members about their views of the results.
- In regard to writing, community partners may physically contribute to drafting or critically revising the content of a manuscript. They may, also, provide intellectual content through critical and constructive comments in conversation or written commentary on drafts. Drafting parts of the manuscript should not be the only criteria for authorship. Ideas for community partners to make an intellectual contribution to the content should be explored by the research team.
- As part of the authorship team, community partners need to have reviewed and approved the manuscript prior to its submission to be published. This applies to online blogs, too.
- While community partners might not have research background, they still have to be accountable to the work that they contribute to the project as presented in the manuscript.

6.4 Acknowledgement

Community partners, who provided substantial input for a publication but not enough to be justified as authors, are expected to be acknowledged in either footnote or

[7] Richards, D. P. et al.(2020). Guidance on authorship with and acknowledgement of patient partners in patient-oriented research, in: *Research Involvement and Engagement* 6(38), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00213-6>.

foreword. For example, it may be appropriate to acknowledge a person who assisted with data collection or project management or functioned as a consultant on the research.

With regards to community partners who are not involved in a project from start to end or might occupy a precarious/vulnerable position in their communities, the research team should communicate with the persons to ensure that they are comfortable with being acknowledged. In the case of vulnerable community members, the conversation can occur when they begin on the project, and acknowledgement can still be given without using the persons' names.

SECTION VII – DISPUTE RESOLUTION

In line with the recommendations of the Horizon 2020 PRO-RES project[8] and the EASA Code of Conduct Working Group[9] the research unit prioritizes "continuous discursive engagement" at every stage of research and collaboration, so as to identify and resolve possible conflicts early on.

In case a conflict should arise in the research unit, the first step is to encourage and mediate conversations between the involved individuals within a project or between members across projects to develop possible solutions. If this strategy should fail, guiding support and conflict mediation may be sought from PIs or the coordination team of the research unit. In a condition that conflict happens between project members, the PI has to address the issue by consulting the conflicting parties in a neutral and unbiased manner. In case that the PI is part of the conflict, then the project members have to look for a neutral organ at the home institution, such as the graduate program coordinator that can help to develop a possible solution. In the next step the coordination office of the GSSC at the University of Cologne, to which all PIs of the research unit are affiliated, may be asked for conflict mediation. In the unlikely case that the conflict persists, the Ombudsperson of the University of Cologne, Prof. Dr. Martin Avenarius (Faculty of Law), or the Committee of the

[8] Horizon PRO-RES project (2020). The PRO-RES Framework, in: PRO-RES project <https://prores-project.eu/framework/#prores> (15.12.2020).

[9] Mathur, C. et al. (2020). Report of the Code of Conduct Working Group (17 July 2020), in: <https://www.easaonline.org/downloads/events/CoCWG_report.pdf> (30.03.21).

German Research Ombudsman (appointed by the DFG) may be contacted for assistance[10]. Recourse to an Ombudsperson institution should only take place after all other avenues of amicable conflict resolution have been explored.

SECTION VIII – REFERENCES

ALLEA (2017). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Revised Edition. ALLEA: Berlin.

DFG (2019). Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice. Code of Conduct. DFG: Bonn.

Dietrich, P. et al. (2010). The role of project collaboration quality and knowledge: integration capability in multi-partner projects. Paper presented at PMI Research Conference: Defining the Future of Project Management, Washington, DC. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.

GAA (n. d.). Basic Principles and Procedures for the Ethical Review of Anthropological Research ["Ethical Guidelines"], in: GAA <https://en.dgska.de/ethics/> (15.12.2020).

GAA (2019). Position Paper on the Handling of Anthropological Research Data, in: GAA <https://www.dgska.de/dgska/forschungsdatenmanagement/> (15.12.2020).

German Research Ombudsman: Ombudsman für die Wissenschaft, in: <https://ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de/?lang=en#ombudsgremium> (11.01.2021).

Horizon PRO-RES project (2020). The PRO-RES Framework, in: PRO-RES project <https://prores-project.eu/framework/#prores> (15.12.2020).

Mathur, C. et al. (2020). Report of the Code of Conduct Working Group (17 July 2020), in: <https://www.easaonline.org/downloads/events/CoCWG_report.pdf> (30.03.21).

McNutt, M. K. et al. (2018). Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication, in: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(11), pp. 2557-2560.

[10] German Research Ombudsman: Ombudsman für die Wissenschaft, in: <https://ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de/?lang=en#ombudsgremium> (11.01.2021).

Richards, D. P. et al. (2020). Guidance on authorship with and acknowledgement of patient partners in patient-oriented research, in: *Research Involvement and Engagement* 6(38), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00213-6>.