

**ETHICAL ISSUES IN COVERT,  
SECURITY AND SURVEILLANCE  
RESEARCH**

# ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

Series Editor: Dr Ron Iphofen, *FACSS, Independent  
Consultant, France*

Recent volumes:

Volume 1: Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the  
Social Sciences, Edited by *Ron Iphofen*

Volume 2: The Ethics of Online Research, Edited by *Kandy Woodfield*

Volume 3: Virtue Ethics in the Conduct and Governance of Social Science  
Research, Edited by *Nathan Emmerich*

Volume 4: Ethics and Integrity in Health and Life Sciences Research, Edited by  
*Zvonimir Koporc*

Volume 5: Ethics and Integrity in Visual Research Methods, Edited by *Savannah  
Dodd*

Volume 6: Indigenous Research Ethics, Edited by *Lily George, Juan Tauri and  
Lindsey Te Ata o Tu MacDonald*

Volume 7: Ethics and Integrity in Research with Children and Young People,  
Edited by *Grace Spencer*

## **Editorial Advisory Group**

Professor Robert Dingwall, *FACSS, Dingwayy Enterprises Ltd and Nottingham  
Trent University, UK*

Dr Nathan Emmerich, *Institute of Ethics, Dublin City University and Queens  
University Belfast, UK*

Professor Mark Israel, *University of Western Australia, Australia*

Dr Janet Lewis, *AcSS, Former Research Director, Joseph Rowntree Foundation,  
UK*

Professor John Oates, *FACSS, Open University, UK*

Associate Professor Martin Tolich, *University of Otago, New Zealand*

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY  
VOLUME 8

# ETHICAL ISSUES IN COVERT, SECURITY AND SURVEILLANCE RESEARCH

EDITED BY

**RON IPHOFEN**

*Independent Consultant, France*

AND

**DÓNAL O'MATHÚNA**

*The Ohio State University, USA*



United Kingdom – North America – Japan  
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited  
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2022



Open access. Editorial matter and selection © 2022 Ron Iphofen and Dónal O'Mathúna. Individual chapters © belongs to the respective chapter authors. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. These works are published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

#### **Reprints and permissions service**

Contact: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

#### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80262-414-4 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-80262-411-3 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-80262-413-7 (Epub)

ISSN: 2398-6018 (Series)



ISOQAR certified  
Management System,  
awarded to Emerald  
for adherence to  
Environmental  
standard  
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985  
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

# CONTENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <i>About the Editors</i>   | vii  |
| <i>About the Contributors</i>  | ix   |
| <i>About the Series Editor</i>   | xv   |
| <i>Series Preface</i><br><i>Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)</i>  | xvii |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i>  | xxi  |
| <br>   |      |
| <b>Introduction: Ethical Issues in Covert, Security and Surveillance Research</b><br><i>Ron Iphofen and Dónal O’Mathúna</i>        | 1    |
| <b>Chapter 1 Surveillance Ethics: An Introduction to an Introduction</b><br><i>Kevin Macnish</i>                                   | 9    |
| <b>Chapter 2 Science, Ethics, and Responsible Research – The Case of Surveillance</b><br><i>Alfonso Alfonsi and Maresa Berliri</i> | 17   |
| <b>Chapter 3 Research Is Not a Private Matter</b><br><i>Paul Spicker</i>   | 29   |
| <b>Chapter 4 Covert Research Ethics</b><br><i>Marco Marzano</i>  | 41   |
| <b>Chapter 5 Taking Shortcuts: Correlation, Not Causation, and the Moral Problems it Brings</b><br><i>Kevin Macnish</i>            | 55   |
| <b>Chapter 6 The Big Data World: Benefits, Threats and Ethical Challenges</b><br><i>Marina Da Bormida</i>                          | 71   |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Chapter 7 Health Data, Public Interest, and Surveillance for Non-health-related Purposes</b>   |     |
| <i>Mark Taylor and Richard Kirkham</i>  | 93  |
| <b>Chapter 8 Privacy and Security: German Perspectives, European Trends and Ethical Implications</b>                                    |     |
| <i>Hartmut Aden</i>   | 119 |
| <b>Chapter 9 A Framework for Reviewing Dual Use Research</b>  |     |
| <i>Simon E. Kolstoe</i>   | 131 |
| <b>Chapter 10 Security Risk Management in Hostile Environments: Community-based and Systems-based Approaches</b>                        |     |
| <i>Daniel Paul and Alex Stedmon</i>   | 145 |
| <b>Chapter 11 Conducting Ethical Research in Sensitive Security Domains: Understanding Threats and the Importance of Building Trust</b> |     |
| <i>Alex Stedmon and Daniel Paul</i>   | 159 |
| <b>Chapter 12 Covert Aspects of Surveillance and the Ethical Issues They Raise</b>  |     |
| <i>David J. Harper, Darren Ellis and Ian Tucker</i>   | 177 |
| <b>Guidance Notes for Reviewers and Policymakers on Covert, Deceptive and Surveillance Research</b>                                     |     |
| <i>Ron Iphofen, Simon E. Kolstoe, Kevin Macnish, Paul Spicker and Dónal O’Mathúna</i>   | 199 |
| <i>Index</i>  | 211 |

## ABOUT THE EDITORS

**Ron Iphofen**, FAcSS (British), is an Independent Consultant based in France with international recognition for expertise on research ethics and professional standards in research. Since 2008, he has presented at over 200 national and international events for universities, government, research institutes and the European Commission (EC) and European Research Council (ERC). He has served in the Universities Sector of the Association for Research Ethics UK. He has acted as consultant, adviser and/or delivered training on research ethics for the Scottish Executive, UK Government Social Research, National Disability Authority (Ireland), National Centre for Social Research, Social Research Association, Audit Commission, Food Standards Agency, Ministry of Justice, BIG Lottery, Local Authorities' Consortium, UK Research Integrity Office, Skills Development Scotland, ANR (French Research Funding agency), SSRC (Canada) and many others. His primary consultative activity at present is for the EC Ethics Unit, Directorate General for Science and Innovation, the Research Executive Agency and the ERC.

**Dónal O'Mathúna** (Irish) is Associate Professor at The Ohio State University, USA, in the College of Nursing and the Center for Bioethics in the College of Medicine. He is the Director of the Cochrane Affiliate at Ohio State's Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare, and a member of the Executive Committee of the Cochrane US Network, which reflects his long-standing involvement with Cochrane, a major producer of reliable health evidence. His interests in bioethics focus on ethical issues in humanitarian settings, disasters and pandemics. He is Visiting Professor of Ethics in the European Masters in Disaster Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Italy. He has led funded research projects into humanitarian research ethics, and has contributed to ethics initiatives and guidelines with the World Health Organization, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund and other international agencies. He has co-edited three volumes addressing various ethical issues in disasters, and has authored numerous peer-reviewed articles.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

**Hartmut Aden** is a Lawyer and Political Scientist. He is Professor of German and European Public Law, Public Policy and Public Administration at the Berlin School of Economics and Law/Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht (HWR Berlin), Vice President for Research of HWR Berlin and member of the Berlin Institute for Safety and Security Research (FÖPS Berlin). He is the founding Academic Director of the MA Programme in International Security Management established in 2018.

**Alfonso Alfonsi** has more than 35 years of experience at international level in social research, training, evaluation and scientific networking. His expertise includes urban development, poverty and social exclusion, religion and modernisation, science ethics and science policies, social and cultural change and socialisation of scientific and technological research. He works as an Expert for organisations of the UN system (such as United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, HABITAT, WORLD BANK and United Nations Development Programme), for the European Union and for Italian bodies (such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs, National Research Council, Lazio Regional Government and Puglia Regional Government). In this framework, he has directed and/or participated in several research projects in Europe, Africa and Asia.

He serves as Science Ethics Expert for the European Commission, by participating in expert groups and evaluation panels (in Seventh Framework Programme and in HORIZON 2020 frameworks).

He participated as an expert in UN high level encounters and other international partnerships, contributing in the drafting of position papers and in the formulation of policy documents and manifestos. He has coordinated international multi-stakeholder networks for development, such as the Network on Services for the Urban Poor of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council or the UN-Habitat International Forum of Researchers on Human Settlements.

**Maresa Berliri** is a Sociologist who has participated in several research projects focussed on the relations between science and society; Responsible Research and Innovation in research performing organisations; social subjectivity on the web and privacy protection; internet governance and digital transition; active citizenship and relations between states and citizens; women in political, scientific and entrepreneurial organisations; and in poverty and social exclusion. Among these projects, it is worth highlighting: CONSENT (consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content service in the digital economy), MAPPING (managing alternatives for privacy, property and internet governance) and RESPECT (rules, expectations and security through privacy enhanced convenient

technologies). She is currently involved in some H2020 Projects including: PRO-RES (PROmoting integrity in the use of RESearch results) and RESBIOS (RESponsible research and innovation grounding practices in BIOSciences).

**Marina Da Bormida** is an R&I Lawyer and Ethics Expert in Italy. She obtained her degree in Law and PhD degree in Legal Issues of the Information Society. She specialised in legal, ethical and societal themes related to information and communication technology research and technological developments in the framework of R&D national and European projects in a wide range of domains (e.g. Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, digital lifestyle, Internet of Things, Factories of the Future and Smart Manufacturing, Cloud Computing, Smart Contracts and Blockchain), with consolidated experience and long-term scientific collaboration with well-known research institutions.

**Dr Darren Ellis** is a chartered Psychologist, Senior Lecturer at the University of East London and Course Leader of the Psychosocial Community Work programme. He is co-author of *Emotion in the Digital Age: Technologies, Data and Psychosocial Life* (Routledge, 2020) for Routledge's Studies in Science, Technology and Society Series and *Social Psychology of Emotion* (Sage, 2015). He co-edited *After lockdown, Opening Up: Psychosocial Transformations in the Wake of Covid-19* (Palgrave, 2021) for Palgrave's Studies in the Psychosocial and *Affect and Social Media: Emotion, Mediation, Anxiety and Contagion* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2018) for Rowman and Littlefield's Radical Cultural Studies Series. He has published articles on a wide range of topics including surveillance studies, for example: 'Stop and Search: Disproportionality, Discretion and Generalisations' (2010, *Police Journal*), 'The Affective Atmospheres of Surveillance' (2013, *Theory and Psychology*) and 'Techno-securitisation of Everyday Life and Cultures of Surveillance—Apathia' (2020, *Science as Culture*).

**David J. Harper** is Professor of Clinical Psychology and Programme Director (Academic) of the Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology at the University of East London, UK. He has co-authored and co-edited a number of books including *Psychology, Mental Health and Distress* (Red Globe Press, 2013), *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy* (Wiley, 2012) and *Deconstructing Psychopathology* (Sage, 1995). He has published journal articles and book chapters on public understandings of surveillance, discourses of paranoia, conspiracy and surveillance in clinical and popular cultures and the history of psychological and psychiatric involvement in national security interrogations.

**Richard Kirkham** is an Administrative Justice Lawyer whose main research area of interest is on redress mechanisms in the administrative justice system and judicial review. His recent publications include *Executive Decision-making and the Courts: Revisiting the Origins of Modern Judicial Review* (Hart Publishing, 2021, edited with T. T. Arvind, Daithí Mac Síthigh and Lindsay Stirton), *A Manifesto for Ombudsman Reform* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2020, edited with C. Gill) and *The*

*Oxford Handbook of Administrative Justice* (OUP, Forthcoming, edited with M. Hertogh, R. Thomas and J. Tomlinson).

**Simon E. Kolstoe**, is a Reader in Bioethics at the University of Portsmouth, and chair of the UK's Ministry of Defence Research Ethics Committee (MODREC). Following a PhD in Biochemistry and ten years conducting Medical Research, his academic and research interests are now focussed on how Ethics, Governance and Integrity processes impact the reliability and effectiveness of medical and human participant research. He also chairs research ethics committees for the UK Health Security Agency and Health Research Authority.

**Kevin Macnish** is Digital Ethics Consulting Manager with Sopra Steria. A former Analyst and Manager at the UK Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) and the the US Government Department of Defense (US DOD), he gained his PhD in Digital Ethics from the University of Leeds in 2013. He has been interviewed by BBC national television and radio and has spoken at both the House of Commons and the House of Lords in relation to digital ethics. Prior to joining Sopra Steria, he was Assistant Professor in Ethics and IT in the Philosophy Department at the University of Twente where his research and consultancy work focussed on the ethics of privacy, artificial intelligence and cybersecurity. He published *The Ethics of Surveillance: An Introduction* (Routledge, 2018) and *Big Data and Democracy* (Edinburgh University Press, 2020). He has published more than 30 academic articles and chapters in his areas of interest, including the chapter on cybersecurity ethics in the forthcoming *Handbook on Digital Ethics* (Oxford University Press) and is a frequent speaker at international trade and academic conferences. He is an independent Ethics Expert for the European Commission, visiting PhD Supervisor at the University of Twente and a member of the International Association of Privacy Professionals' Research Advisory Board.

**Marco Marzano** is Professor of Sociology of Organizations at the University of Bergamo, Italy. His research focusses on religion, Catholicism, cancer, illness narrative and organisation theory. In terms of methodological approaches, he is interested in ethnography, qualitative research, investigative methods and covert research. He has a strong interest in social research ethics. He is the author of numerous international publications in different languages (English, German, Italian and soon Polish and French) and he has been a visiting professor at many universities in different countries around the world (from the UK to the USA, from Brazil to Argentina, from the Czech Republic to Romania). He has participated in numerous international conferences, sometimes as a keynote speaker.

**Daniel Paul** is a Security Risk Management Consultant, with a specialism in crisis management and security for high-risk environments. He started out his career in the British Army before briefly working a project manager for the humanitarian sector. It was here he realised he had a passion for keeping others safe and moved into the security management field. He completed his PhD in 2019, where he studied the

role of knowledge management in keeping humanitarian workers safe when working in dangerous environments. His PhD provided a knowledge management framework for eliciting and sharing security specific information within organisations in order to improve security risk management systems. He also holds a Bachelors in International Security and Disaster Management. Alongside consultancy work, he lectures at Coventry University in Disaster Management. He runs modules in disaster preparedness, humanitarian essentials and lectures on the topics of security management, disaster response and risk management.

**Paul Spicker** is a writer and commentator on Social Policy. His published work includes 20 books, several shorter works and over 100 academic papers. His studies of housing and welfare rights developed from his early career; since then, his research has included studies related to benefit delivery systems, the care of old people, psychiatric patients, housing management and local anti-poverty strategy. He is a consultant on social welfare in practice, and has done work for a range of agencies at local, national and international levels. After teaching at Nottingham Trent University and the University of Dundee, he held the Grampian Chair of Public Policy at Robert Gordon University (RGU) from 2001 to 2015, and was Director of its Centre for Public Policy and Management. He is now an Emeritus Professor of RGU.

**Alex Stedmon**, CSci CPsychol CERgHF AFBPsS FCIEHF FRSA, is a Professor of Human Factors specialising in security and defence. He has also been elected as President of the Chartered Institute of Ergonomics and Human Factors (2022) and been awarded a Royal Academy of Engineering Visiting Professor role in the Psychology Department at Cardiff University. He previously worked for the Ministry of Defence before a move into academia where his research focussed on human factors issues of technology use and contextual methods for investigating public safety in various security environments. He was a Technical Lead on a Strategic Security Project in the run up to the London Olympics and has conducted pioneering research in deception, safeguarding public spaces and novel collaborative networks for security. He has contributed to winning over £33million of research funding to date and has over 230 mainly peer-reviewed publications. He was the lead Editor of the first book on *Counter-terrorism and Hostile Intent: Human Factors Theory and Application* (Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015). During his university career, he was chair of various ethics committees and Deputy Director of Ethics for the Faculty of Engineering at Coventry University. In 2019, he retired from academia to work as a consultant for various international clients and conduct expert witness roles for the courts.

**Mark Taylor** is an Associate Professor in Health Law and Regulation at Melbourne Law School and Deputy Director of the research group HeLEX, which focusses on the legal and regulatory frameworks governing new health technologies. His own research is focussed on the regulation of personal information with emphasis on health and genetic data. He seeks to develop a concept of privacy that is capable of reconciling individual and community (privacy) interests with a broader (public) interest in access, use and management of personal health information.

**Ian Tucker** is Professor of Health and Social Psychology at The University of East London. His research interests include mental health, emotion and affect, digital media and surveillance. He has published empirical and theoretical work on care and recovery in a range of environments for mental health support, digital peer support in mental health and surveillance. He is currently working on a UKRI MARCH Network+ project exploring the impact of digital platforms in relation to ‘community assets’ (e.g. arts and creative communities) and experiences of mental ill-health. He is co-author of *Social Psychology of Emotion* (Sage, 2020) and *Emotion in the Digital Age: Technologies, Data and Psychosocial Life* (Routledge, 2020), for Routledge’s Studies in Science, Technology and Society Series.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## ABOUT THE SERIES EDITOR

**Ron Iphofen**, FAcSS, is Executive Editor of the Emerald book series *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity* and edited Volume 1 in the series, *Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the Social Sciences* (2017). He is an Independent Research Consultant, a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Society of Medicine. Since retiring as Director of Postgraduate Studies in the School of Healthcare Sciences, Bangor University, his major activity has been as an Adviser to the European Commission (EC) and its agencies, the European Research Council (ERC) and the Research Executive Agency on both the Seventh Framework Programme and the Horizon 2020. His consultancy work has covered a range of research agencies (in government and independent) across Europe. He was Vice Chair of the UK Social Research Association (SRA), updated their Ethics Guidelines and now convenes the SRA's Research Ethics Forum. He was Scientific Consultant on the EC RESPECT project – establishing pan-European standards in the social sciences and chaired the Ethics and Societal Impact Advisory Group for another EC-funded European Demonstration Project on mass transit security (SECUR-ED). He has advised the UK Research Integrity Office, the National Disability Authority of the Irish Ministry of Justice, the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, the Scottish Executive, UK Government Social Research, National Centre for Social Research, the Audit Commission, the Food Standards Agency, the Ministry of Justice, the BIG Lottery, a UK Local Authorities' Consortium, Skills Development Scotland, Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR the French Research Funding agency) among many others. He was founding Executive Editor of the Emerald gerontology journal *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*. He published *Ethical Decision Making in Social Research: A Practical Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009 and 2011) and coedited with Martin Tolich *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (Sage, 2018). He is currently leading a new €2.8M European Commission-funded project (PRO-RES) that aims at promoting ethics and integrity in all non-medical research (2018–2021).

*This page intentionally left blank*

# SERIES PREFACE

Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)

This book series, *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity*, grew out of foundational work with a group of Fellows of the UK Academy of Social Sciences who were all concerned to ensure that lessons learned from previous work were built upon and improved in the interests of the production of robust research practices of high quality. Duplication or unnecessary repetitions of earlier research and ignorance of existing work were seen as hindrances to research progress. Individual researchers, research professions and society all suffer in having to pay the costs in time, energy and money of delayed progress and superfluous repetitions. There is little excuse for failure to build on existing knowledge and practice given modern search technologies unless selfish ‘domain protectionism’ leads researchers to ignore existing work and seek credit for innovations already accomplished. Our concern was to aid well-motivated researchers to quickly discover existing progress made in ethical research in terms of topic, method and/or discipline and to move on with their own work more productively and to discover the best, most effective means to disseminate their own findings so that other researchers could, in turn, contribute to research progress.

It is true that there is a plethora of ethics codes and guidelines with researchers left to themselves to judge those more appropriate to their proposed activity. The same questions are repeatedly asked on discussion forums about how to proceed when similar long-standing problems in the field are being confronted afresh by novice researchers. Researchers and members of ethics review boards alike are faced with selecting the most appropriate codes or guidelines for their current purpose, eliding differences and similarities in a labyrinth of uncertainty. It is no wonder that novice researchers can despair in their search for guidance and experienced researchers may be tempted by the ‘checklist mentality’ that appears to characterise a meeting of formalised ethics requirements and permit their conscience-free pursuit of a cherished programme of research.

If risks of harm to the public and to researchers are to be kept to a minimum and if professional standards in the conduct of scientific research are to be maintained, the more that fundamental understandings of ethical behaviour in research are shared the better. If progress is made in one sphere everyone gains from it being generally acknowledged and understood. If foundational work is conducted everyone gains from being able to build on and develop further that work.

Nor can it be assumed that formal ethics review committees are able to resolve the dilemmas or meet the challenges involved. Enough has been written about such review bodies to make their limitations clear. Crucially, they cannot follow researchers into the field to monitor their every action; they cannot anticipate all of the emergent ethical dilemmas nor, even, follow through to the publication of findings. There is no adequate penalty for neglect through incompetence, nor worse, for conscious omissions of evidence. We have to rely upon the virtues of the individual researcher alongside the skills of journal reviewers and funding agency evaluators. We need to constantly monitor scientific integrity at the corporate and at the individual level. These are issues of quality as well as morality.

Within the research ethics field new problems, issues and concerns and new ways of collecting data continue to emerge regularly. This should not be surprising as social, economic and technological change necessitate constant re-evaluation of research conduct. Standard approaches to research ethics such as valid informed consent, inclusion/exclusion criteria, vulnerable subjects and covert studies need to be re-considered as developing social contexts and methodological innovation, interdisciplinary research and economic pressures pose new challenges to convention. Innovations in technology and method challenge our understanding of 'the public' and 'the private'. Researchers need to think even more clearly about the balance of harm and benefit to their subjects, to themselves and to society. This series proposes to address such new and continuing challenges for both funders, research managers, research ethics committees and researchers in the field as they emerge. The concerns and interests are global and well recognised by researchers and commissioners alike around the world but with varying commitments at both the procedural and the practical levels. This series is designed to suggest realistic solutions to these challenges – this practical angle is the *unique selling proposition* for the series. Each volume will raise and address the key issues in the debates, but also strive to suggest ways forward that maintain the key ethical concerns of respect for human rights and dignity, while sustaining pragmatic guidance for future research developments. A series such as this aims to offer practical help and guidance in actual research engagements as well as meeting the often varied and challenging demands of research ethics review. The approach will not be one of abstract moral philosophy; instead it will seek to help researchers think through the potential harms and benefits of their work in the proposal stage and assist their reflection of the big ethical moments that they face in the field often when there may be no one to advise them in terms of their societal impact and acceptance.

While the research community can be highly imaginative both in the fields of study and methodological innovation, the structures of management and funding, and the pressure to publish to fulfil league table quotas can pressure researchers into errors of judgement that have personal and professional consequences. The series aims to adopt an approach that promotes good practice and sets principles, values and standards that serve as models to aid successful research outcomes. There is clear international appeal as commissioners and researchers alike share a vested interest in the global promotion of professional virtues that lead to the public acceptability of good research. In an increasingly global world in

research terms, there is little point in applying too localised a morality, nor one that implies a solely Western hegemony of values. If standards ‘matter’, it seems evident that they should ‘matter’ to and for all. Only then can the growth of interdisciplinary and multi-national projects be accomplished effectively and with a shared concern for potential harms and benefits. While a diversity of experience and local interests is acknowledged, there are existing, proven models of good practice which can help research practitioners in emergent nations build their policies and processes to suit their own circumstances. We need to see that consensus positions effectively guide the work of scientists across the globe and secure minimal participant harm and maximum societal benefit – and, additionally, that instances of fraudulence, corruption and dishonesty in science decrease as a consequence.

Perhaps some forms of truly independent formal ethics scrutiny can help maintain the integrity of research professions in an era of enhanced concerns over data security, privacy and human rights legislation. But it is essential to guard against rigid conformity to what can become administrative procedures. The consistency we seek to assist researchers in understanding what constitutes ‘proper behaviour’ does not imply uniformity. Having principles does not lead inexorably to an adherence to principlism. Indeed, sincerely held principles can be in conflict in differing contexts. No one practice is necessarily the best approach in all circumstances. But if researchers are aware of the range of possible ways in which their work can be accomplished ethically and with integrity, they can be free to apply the approach that works or is necessary in their setting. Guides to ‘good’ ways of doing things should not be taken as the ‘only’ way of proceeding. A rigidity in outlook does no favours to methodological innovation, nor to the research subjects or participants that they are supposed to protect. If there were to be any principles that should be rigidly adhered to they should include flexibility, open-mindedness, the recognition of the range of challenging situations to be met in the field – principles that in essence amount to a sense of proportionality. And these principles should apply equally to researchers and ethics reviewers alike. To accomplish that requires ethics reviewers to think afresh about each new research proposal, to detach from pre-formed opinions and prejudices, while still learning from and applying the lessons of the past. Principles such as these must also apply to funding and commissioning agencies, to research institutions and to professional associations and their learned societies. Our integrity as researchers demands that we recognise that the rights of our funders and research participants and/or subjects are to be valued alongside our cherished research goals and seek to embody such principles in the research process from the outset. This series will strive to seek just how that might be accomplished in the best interests of all.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This open access collection was made possible and commissioned under the auspices of the EU-funded PRO-RES Project. PRO-RES is a European Commission-funded project aiming to PROMote ethics and integrity in non-medical RESearch by building an evidence-supported guidance framework for all non-medical sciences and humanities disciplines adopting social science methodologies. The project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 788352. The editors are consortium partners and the authors for the chapters represent a range of stakeholders committed to the aims of the project – including other consortium partners. The editors wish to express their gratitude for the care and commitment demonstrated by the authors to this collection in addressing the sensitive and complex ethical issues raised in this research arena.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# INTRODUCTION: ETHICAL ISSUES IN COVERT, SECURITY AND SURVEILLANCE RESEARCH

Ron Iphofen and Dónal O'Mathúna

## ABSTRACT

*In light of the many crises and catastrophes faced in the modern world, policymakers frequently make claims to be 'following the science' or being 'governed by the data'. Yet, conflict based on inequalities continue to fuel dissatisfaction with the decisions and actions of authorities. Research into public security may require surveillance and covert observations, all of which are subject to major ethical challenges. Any neat distinction between covert and overt research is difficult to maintain given the variety of definitions used for all the terms addressed here. Covert research may be ethically justified and is not necessarily deceptive. In any case, deception may be ethical if engaged in for the 'right' reasons. Modern research sites and innovative research methods may enhance opportunities for covert work. In all surveillance and covert work, care must be taken about how consent is managed, how observed subjects are protected and harm to all involved minimised in all situations.*

**Keywords:** Ethical surveillance; covert research; participant observation; security research; dual use; research ethics review

---

Ethical Issues in Covert, Security and Surveillance Research  
Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Volume 8, 1–8



Copyright © 2022 by Ron Iphofen and Dónal O'Mathúna. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. These works are published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>  
ISSN: 2398-6018/doi:10.1108/S2398-60182021000008001

## INTRODUCTION

A series of major significant events and catastrophes have stimulated the developed world to better realise the widely different interpretations of what capitalist, liberal democracies see as progress: from 9/11, the Arab Spring, mass migrations from conflict-ridden regions of the world, to the COVID-19 pandemic, various events have led to growing pressure to make sense of their causes and consequences. Policymakers look to 'science' to supply the answers, and claim they are 'following the science' when making decisions and policies. However, sometimes complex issues are thought through hastily, the studies used to inform policies are not carefully evaluated in terms of their methods or ethics, and policies are introduced with a degree of confidence not justified by the 'science.' When such policies turn out to be ineffective, the blame gets diverted to the researchers.

The scientific method and its application to the understanding of humanity and our environment has improved the human living condition significantly, but such improvements are not enjoyed by all. Inequality creates conflict which can lead to everything from distrust to despair, or in the face of overwhelming military dominance, can fuel radicalism and the continued development of terrorism by disaffected groups. Continuing research in the areas of defence, security and surveillance is critical to understand conflict, but carrying out such research raises distinct methodological and ethical challenges. Occasionally, the best research must be 'covert' or risk missing the key elements that account for events that are not willingly disclosed by those with malicious or nefarious intent, or by those who cannot risk becoming participants.

The notion of covert research has long held challenges for ethics reviewers. Part of the problem lies with precisely what is meant by 'covert'. If it simply refers to 'hidden' information relating to the research, then pretty much all research contains covert elements since only the active researcher, in the field or in the laboratory, knows everything that is going on and, in any case, it might not be in the interests of funders, co-researchers or research subjects to be told everything that is contained in or required of a research engagement. To do so might compromise the method and/or the research design without bringing any clear ethical advantage nor minimising any risks of harm to all involved (Iphofen, 2011).

Amongst some observers, another view exists that some inherently unethical research procedures exist, and covert observation is one of them. Such procedures can range from making observations of human behaviour in public places, or lurking on social media to observe how people manage their online relationships, to actively participating in a group or community without identifying oneself as a 'researcher'. This view of covert observation is seen by some as particularly problematic since it appears to necessarily imply deception since those being observed are not directly informed of the observation. Part of the problem here is with what one means by deception. We would argue that the term deception is used for a range of activities, not just telling a lie. It can involve an act or statement which misleads, or hides the

truth, or promotes a belief, concept or an idea that is explicitly known not to be true (a lie). Deception can involve dissimulation, propaganda and sleight of hand, as well as distraction, camouflage or concealment, and deception can occur without being viewed as ethically problematic. For example, most commercial advertising is understood to be deceptive in the sense of manipulating the attractiveness of products and/or services in order to promote sales. We, the consumers, know that and vary in the ways in which we permit ourselves to be deceived by advertising. Yet, if the advertising stated that the product was available for £100, and nowhere sold it for less than £1,000, we would feel deceived in a way in which we would say was wrong because clearly false information was provided.

In a similar way, forms of 'deception' are vital to achieving research goals even whilst other forms are unethical. The research 'gold standard' of the double blind randomised controlled trial for drug therapies relies upon deliberate self-deception in terms of permitting the knowing concealment of the potentially 'active' substance and the application of a placebo. It is well known that part of the efficacy of a placebo for some subjects relies on the participants 'deceiving themselves' into believing they are, in fact, receiving the active substance. In other research, letting people know they are being observed might result in an alteration of their behaviour and prevent their 'true', or authentic natural behaviour, from being studied. Some research can involve a component of deception where, for example, participants are told they will be interviewed about a certain topic and audio visually recorded to help analyse the interview. This topic is part of the research study, but during every interview, a second researcher regularly gets phone messages and replies to them. Participants are not informed that the research had a second aim to analyse people's reactions to others responding to text messages during interviews. This is a form of deception, though the researchers do not explicitly lie to the participants.

If a research proposal is subject to ethics appraisal of some sort (a research ethics committee (REC) or institutional review board (IRB)) it may be the case that some members regard covert observation or deception as inherently unethical. If that were true, much of early social science would have been ruled out and many specific schools of thought (e.g. Chicago sociology and Stanford psychology) would have been proscribed. Even if no REC scrutiny is required of a research action, it remains the responsibility of the professional researcher to find the best way to protect their subjects, and themselves, when conducting research that has any degree of covert or deceptive elements within it.

Extensive opportunities for covert observation have emerged with the appearance of online social media which have given rise to new forms of community and personal identity for people which pose real challenges to the key ethical research principles of consenting, voluntary participation and vulnerability. At the same time, such media have given rise to innovative methodological approaches for researchers – in terms of access to a massive range of both qualitative and quantitative data and, as a result, our understanding of public and private space has become more complicated.

## BEING COVERT

Being covert in essence means that some, if not all, information is withheld about the fact that some research or 'evidence-gathering' activity is occurring. Taking such an approach requires ensuring an appropriate balance exists and has been justified between methodological requirements and the ethical responsibility to protect the subject from undue interference. If there are really strong methodological reasons for covert observation, and a study would be worthless without it, it could be justified – as long as there are no undue consequences for those under observation. Several of the chapters in this collection offer suggestions and examples about when this might be justifiable. Typically, this is done by concealing the identities of those being observed and the site of the study. The subject *may* be protected by ensuring that it would be impossible for anyone to find out who the subject of study is and where the study is being conducted. If such 'protection' and the 'value' of the study (to society and, possibly, even to the individuals/group under study) outweighs any conceivable harm – the ethical justification is strengthened. But neither full protection nor full lack of intrusion can be guaranteed and the notion of what constitutes 'harm' can vary greatly between individuals. These justifications are complex, and people will differ in their overall assessments of the arguments.

For both covert and any form of surveillance research a conventional solution is to somehow signal to those who might be affected that the work is being carried out – such as notices in public venues or social media sites, or, for studies in workplaces, notices sent to all staff likely to be present. Inevitably, this compromises the research design to some degree: the subjects might behave differently as a consequence of knowing that they might be observed; the sample selection might be compromised as all the subjects might not have seen the research notices and may behave differently; the reliability of the evidence gathered might thus be interfered with; and, more problematically, this approach might not even secure valid informed consent. There would be no evidence, other than the notice, that the population/subjects were truly informed. People could say they had not seen the notice and, if they hear about it subsequently, could get upset about being observed. There would then have to be a grievance procedure for redress of any perceived harm – once again compromising the methodology.

One thing that is agreed upon is the need to secure the consent of the owners of the premises, site and/or organisation in which the study is to occur. Insurance indemnity issues will be involved for sure. This has become a particular bone of contention in social media studies where it is argued that 'the expectation of privacy' is illusory and by no means protected by any statements of terms and conditions (see [Woodfield, 2018](#)). Some suggest that there should be little concern about observations in public places for a range of reasons: people are observing each other anyway; we sit in café terraces and 'watch the world go by', and people do not complain. Whether we make notes about what we see, or write about and publish our observations, is of secondary concern. If people are unhappy about how they are described, and their identities revealed, the only thing they can do is to take it to law. Journalists and novelists are less bothered about this sort of behaviour than professional researchers. One could argue that the researcher's motives are likely to be more 'pure' – whatever that means!

## RESTRICTING INFORMED CONSENT

Situations occur when information about the full nature of a study may have to be restricted in order to comply with a specific research design. This is particularly likely to occur with covert participant observational studies or ethnographic field research in which the researcher's role is not fully disclosed – also known as immersive fieldwork. To seek consent from 'subjects' or site owners in such a situation would nullify the research method and the rationale for its adoption. But any exemptions to seeking consent must be detailed together with an explanation of why they have occurred. Thus, there may be broad methodological justifications and more specific, strategic reasons to do with the safety of researchers and/or research subjects quite apart from securing the research design. Incomplete disclosure may be justified if it entailed minimal risks to the subjects, if some way of debriefing them could be made available, and, perhaps, if there were a way to provide for the appropriate dissemination of findings to subjects. In fact, it may be the case that subjects could suffer from 'information overload' if they are told too much. After all they are not the professionals whose careers are dependent upon satisfactory outcomes. Even some form of retrospective consent could be sought to allay fears.

Observational studies in which the participants are not and never will be made aware that they are being observed offer the best examples of exceptions to fully informed consent. There have been many such 'classic' ethnographic studies in the history of social science research and they usually cover the fringe areas of society – criminality, social deviance, the sex industry, terrorist groups and religious cults. In a classic text, Moser and Kalton (1971) described observation as '... the classic method of scientific enquiry' (p. 244) and expressed surprise at the relatively infrequent use of observational methods by social scientists when one reflects that '... they are literally surrounded by their subject matter'. Their only ethical concern was that:

The method must be suitable for investigating the problem in which the social scientist is interested; it must be appropriate to the populations and samples he [*sic.*] wishes to study; and it should be reasonably reliable and objective. (Moser & Kalton, 1971, p. 244)

They do caution about the potential for bias since it depends upon the observer's recording skills and their interpretations of the meanings or intentions behind the behaviour:

[...] observers are so much part of their subject matter that they may fail to see it objectively; ... their vision may be distorted by what they are used to seeing or what they expect to see; and ... they may find it hard to present a report in which observation is satisfactorily distinguished from inference and interpretation. (Moser & Kalton, 1971, p. 253)

## COVERT STUDIES

Sidhir Venkatesh claims that he could not have conducted his research on hustlers, prostitutes and drug dealers in any detail if they had been aware of his status as a researcher. His analysis of a drug dealing gang's accounts demonstrated how it adopted a business model successfully employed by many other modern

businesses. He explains that conventional research instruments such as questionnaires and interview schedules would be entirely inappropriate and ineffective in such situations and would not help researchers trying to learn about the lives of poor and marginalised communities. He saw that just as his research subjects were 'hustling' for money, drugs, sexual favours and so on, he was also hustling for the data that he saw as vital to his research goals. He had to become imaginative, devious and, therefore, covert in gaining information – otherwise he would be seen as an agent of the authorities and a threat to his respondents' access to services (Venkatesh, 2008).

It is vital that during the ethics appraisal process – via RECs or IRBs – the use of deception that is necessarily an element of covert research and/or surveillance should not be necessarily ruled out as inherently morally unacceptable. The question facing an ethics committee should not be: 'Is deception wrong?' To answer that in the affirmative would be to deny practices that are central to human civilisation – politics, economics and, indeed, normal social interaction. Rather the committee should ask: 'Would the form of deception proposed or implied here harm the research participants, the researchers and/or society in general in any way?' This is not an easy question to answer since the harms would have to be balanced against the benefits accruing to all of those constituent groups if the research was conducted successfully. As Robert Rosenhal has pointed out:

[...] the ... researcher whose study might reduce violence or racism or sexism, but who refuses to do the study because it involves deception, has not solved an ethical problem but only traded it in for another. (cited in Bok, 1979, p. 192)

Another key question about deception has to do with whether or not it damages the trust the general public (and so future potential research participants) have in researchers. If deception leads to an undermining of trust, and so a reluctance to participate in research, this is a risk to the success of future research projects (Bok, 1979, p. 205 *et seq.*). The benefits to society of future research are thereby jeopardised by the 'contamination of the field'.

Thus, we are always confronted with a conflict of values. If we regard the acquisition of knowledge about human behaviour as a positive value, and if an experiment using deception constitutes a significant contribution to such knowledge which could not be very well achieved by other means, then we cannot unequivocally rule out this experiment. The question for us is not simply whether it does or does not use deception, but whether the amount and types of deception are justified by the significance of the study and the unavailability of alternative (that is, deception-free) procedures. (Kelman, 1967 in Bynner & Stribley, 1979, p. 190)

Another way of addressing this is to consider it alongside the issues of consent and vulnerability. Thus, if the form of deception proposed in a research project minimises the research subjects' capacity to consent and makes them more vulnerable to harm without substantially contributing to societal benefit then it becomes harder to ethically justify it going ahead. It is a complex question – but one that cannot be dealt with simply by suggesting that deception in research is inherently wrong.

## INTRUSIVENESS

Finally, ethics review committees often ask whether a piece of research is likely to be excessively intrusive and so ‘disturbing’ the subjects’ normal life routines. Of course, all research is to some extent intrusive, but that intrusiveness is variable – dependent upon how much of the respondents’ time, energy and so on it takes up and, not to be forgotten, how intrusive the subsequent reporting of findings might be. Intrusiveness also needs to be balanced against the concerns addressed above – thus, ironically, the more covert a piece of research, the less intrusive in ordinary lives it is likely to be. It might become more intrusive depending upon how and where research findings are published – but that merely raises another set of ethical concerns.

In practical terms, then, to maintain the dignity and personhood of research subjects one would have to anticipate the potential limitations to their participation in research and adjust methodologies accordingly. So, perhaps paradoxically, given the condemnation of covert research in some circles, it could be argued that observation could be the least intrusive way of researching aspects of the lives of vulnerable people since it is less likely to challenge them emotionally and physically. A range of naturalistic observation methods could be employed for which in some cases they need not be made aware and, in others, might be positively enjoyed (Clark, 2007). In qualitative research, in particular it may be impossible to maintain a neat distinction between covert and overt research. Again, as Murphy and Dingwall (2001, chapter 23) have explained, settings are often more complex and changeable than can be anticipated.

## THIS VOLUME

Drawing on an international authorship, this volume strives to address these key and often overlapping issues that become entangled in so many contemporary research ethics challenges. The volume begins with a general overview of the ethical issues with surveillance research, before considering the benefits and challenges of handling Big Data and how this affects concepts of privacy. This is seen as important to provide security in an increasingly insecure society, especially in relation to state intervention and monitoring, but such research must be conducted responsibly to avoid fuelling further distrust. The theme of privacy in civil society is considered in Chapter 3 in relation to the issues facing researchers seeking consent to conduct research using surveillance or covert or deceptive methods. Chapter 4 explores covert research in greater depth, exploring reasons for and against the use of various forms of covert methods. Chapter 5 examines a trend within research to explore correlation rather than causation, which raises a number of ethical issues, particularly in the context of Big Data, the focus of a number of subsequent chapters. Chapter 6 examines claims that ethical issues with Big Data are addressed through anonymisation, and points to the need for an ethical framework to ensure data are collected and used appropriately. Chapter 7 switches focus to examine ethical concerns with state authorities using health-related data for non-health purposes, and the implications of this for researchers

using such data. Chapter 8 turns to examine data protection in a German context given its distinct historical experience with state authorities surveilling citizens for the purposes of oppression. The ethical issues with dual use research are examined in Chapter 9, especially when research results have the potential to be used for military purposes. Chapter 10 explores ethical tensions between community-based and systems-based (or organisational) approaches to address security concerns amongst humanitarian workers. Chapter 11 continues the focus on security research and examines the challenges of collecting data using various research methods in ways that protect participants from security breaches. The final chapter provides two concise lists of recommendations for research involving surveillance, covert and deceptive methods. One set of guidance is provided for reviewers of such research, and another set for policymakers. We offer these as a concise summary of the in-depth discussions and analyses provided throughout the volume by this group of internationally esteemed and respected authors.

## REFERENCES

- Bok, S. (1979). *Lying: Moral choice in public and private life*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Clark, A. (2007). *Making observations: The potential of observation methods for gerontology*. London: Centre for Policy on Ageing.
- Iphofen, R. (2011). *Ethical decision making in social research: A practical guide* (pp.8, 36, 41, 45–46, 79 et seq). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iphofen, R. (2011/2013). *Research ethics in ethnography/anthropology* (DG Research and Innovation). Brussels: European Commission.
- Kelman, H. C. (1967). Human use of human subjects: The problem of deception in social psychological experiments. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67, 1–11. Republished in Bynner, J., & Stribley, K. M. (1979). *Social research: Principles and procedures*. London: Longman.
- Moser, C. A., & Kalton, G. (1971). *Survey methods in social investigation* (2nd ed.). Aldershot: Ashgate (2001 reprint) (first published 1958).
- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2001). The ethics of ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 339–351). London: Sage.
- Venkatesh, S. (2008). *Gang leader for a day*. London: Allen Lane.
- Woodfield, K. (2018). *The ethics of online research* (Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Vol. 2). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.