Research & Methods
ISSN 1234-9224, e-ISSN 2544-0799
Vol. 34 (1, 2025)
The Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio, USA
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
https://ask.ifispan.edu.pl/
https://doi.org/10.18061/ask.v34i1.0001

# Between the will of respondents and the obligation of comprehensive explanations. The question of authorisation in sociological research

**Katarzyna Andrejuk**
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,
Polish Academy of Sciences
Nowy Świat 72, 00-330 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: katarzyna.andrejuk@ifispan.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3397-152X

**Klaudia Khan**
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,
Polish Academy of Sciences
Nowy Świat 72, 00-330 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: klaudia.khan@gssr.edu.pl

**Abstract** The aim of the article is to analyse the possibility and extent of authorisation of empirical material by research participants, including authorisation of interviews in qualitative studies. The institution of authorisation (*autoryzacja*) is well known in Polish Press Law and journalistic practice; however, research participants sometimes also request authorisation of their interviews. This article examines provisions of national and European research ethics, which may be interpreted as relating to aspects of authorisation. It formulates the rules and limitations of authorisation in scientific research, indicating that its scope is not regulated by law. Any potential right to authorise interviews or other empirical material may therefore be agreed upon in specific cases at the pre-interview stage. The article also indicates that confidentiality of academic interviews has similar functions to that of authorisation: anonymisation of research material prevents the identification of interviewees who require authorisation because they do not want to share their views and opinions under their full names.

**Keywords**: Authorisation, post-interview consent, research ethics, sociological interviews

## INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary academy, there is an increasing emphasis on the ethical aspects of social research. These encompass the various stages of academic work: both the rules for disseminating and storing research results and the rules for collecting empirical material (see for example: Allmark et al. 2009; Hammersley, Traianou 2012, Hedgecoe 2008; Andrejuk 2014, 2024). The latter includes ethical challenges regarding the relationship with research subjects, such as comprehensively informing them about the study and obtaining their informed consent, that is, in general, ensuring fairness and transparency in interactions between researchers and research subjects. For this reason, it is important to examine the issue of authorisation from an academic research perspective. This matter is not often addressed in methodological and ethical analyses, yet it concerns a problem that is extremely timely and relevant from the perspective of research ethics. In this article, we use the term "authorisation" (Polish: *autoryzacja*, form of post-interview consent) to describe the procedure in which interviewees have the right to interfere in the final content of the interview, introducing changes before final acceptance of an official publishable version. The procedure of authorisation also includes the right to withdraw statements made in the interview.

The obligation to authorise press (media) statements is a legal requirement in some countries, especially in Central and Eastern European countries, including Poland. Due to the globalisation of academic activities and the internationalisation of research, the relevance of this issue goes far beyond local academic work in individual countries. An increasing number of scientific projects are being conducted on a transnational scale: teams from different countries prepare publications together, so that the approach to research in one of the participating countries affects the results of international projects.

Disregarding requests for authorisation may result in hesitation towards participating in the study, a rejection of research invitations and, therefore, may affect the quality of the research material. On the other hand, excessive corrections and changes made during the authorisation process may also reduce the quality of the empirical material. The degree of respondents' interference with the material should be understood through the prism of the aims and relevance of the empirical research material. A functional approach makes it clear that the role of qualitative research is firstly to provide information, secondly to understand the perspectives of different actors, and thirdly to provide more valuable and comprehensive interpretations that take into account different points of view.

There are considerations among researchers from Central and Eastern Europe regarding the possible application of the concept of authorisation in academic research. For example, Izabela Lewandowska (2009) writes that authorisation is

not necessary if only a fragment of an interview is published and not the whole interview. In the post-authorisation versions of the statements, research participants change the style, soften the focus of views and judgements, delete some passages or add new issues – this makes the post-authorisation interviews less authentic than the first versions collected by the researchers (Lewandowska 2009: 494). Other researchers emphasise that de-subjectification and subjectification of the research subject constitutes an important challenge (Kaźmierska 2024). Sylwia Męcfal (2020), on the other hand, shows in her analysis that the use of respondents' real identities and simultaneous authorisation rarely occur in Polish research. It also happens, even more rarely, that the authorisation of interview transcriptions is combined with interviewee anonymisation (Męcfal 2020: 61). These analyses show that the issue of authorisation has so far been considered mainly where there is a risk of revealing the identity of the interviewees, even though the name has been removed from the interview. The point of reference here is often biographical interviews within the oral history approach, which reveal so many details of the interviewees' lives that they can be easily identified.

## RESEARCH METHOD

The article focuses on the analysis of ethical regulations (both national and supranational) in comparison with legal requirements. It presents these matters in the context of the principles and good practices followed by academic researchers. The research method, especially in points 1)-2), is based on the formal-dogmatic method, which despite some reservations remains crucial for analysing laws and norms (see e.g. Bałaban 2024; Gizbert-Studnicki 2013; Kijańska 2025). The formal-dogmatic method was supplemented in point 3) with a functional approach, in line with the appeals formulated in contemporary legal methodological literature (see Kisilowska 2023). The method in this article includes the following steps: 1) compiling a pool of ethical codes key to the social sciences in Poland and identifying ethical standards that directly or indirectly relate to the problems of authorisation; 2) exegesis of norms, explaining the significance of the applicable ethical standards for the issue of authorisation, taking into account the specific linguistic constructions in these standards (general clauses) and the principles of linguistic and systemic interpretation, with the support of functional interpretation; 3) presenting the potential (dis)functionalities of authorisation, differences and specificities of the concept of consent to interviews in an academic context.

The article was inspired by empirical research on immigrant platform work in Poland. However, this article assumes that authorisation issues have a much broader significance and are not limited to migration studies. This assumption is also confirmed by the codes of ethics analysed in this study. Therefore, the

article deals generally with the norms governing relations between respondents and researchers in the social sciences and is not limited to any single subdiscipline. It should be emphasised that requests for authorisation are not common in the course of academic research, but appear particularly in the case of interviews with respondents representing institutions. Those who do not speak on their own behalf, but present the views and opinions of a certain (state or local) office or organisation, may seek more control of the narrative, as their statements do not refer to private views.

## *CHALLENGES* OF AUTHORISATION – BETWEEN LAW AND ETHICS

Polish Press Law allows persons giving statements to authorise interviews. According to Article 14a of the Prawo Prasowe (Press Law), "A journalist may not refuse to authorise a literally quoted statement to the person providing the information, provided that it has not been previously published or made in public. The journalist shall inform the person providing the information, before providing it, of the right to authorise the verbatim quoted statement. The person providing the information shall, as soon as he or she has been informed by the journalist of the information referred to in paragraph 2, notify him or her of the request to authorise the verbatim quoted statement." Regardless of the possible impact of the authorisation procedure on the collection of empirical material in social research, it should be noted that the institution of authorisation itself also raises critical voices among media scholars and lawyers: it is emphasised that the obligation to authorise can be treated as a restriction of media freedom, and that the lack of authorisation should not be sanctioned criminally (Ossowska-Salamonowicz 2012).

Sociologists conducting academic research are not journalists and are therefore not bound by press law. The requirements for researchers in the collection of empirical material are different. They are defined by ethical standards and not by legal requirements. Moreover, they do not directly address the issue of authorisation, but recommend a certain approach towards research participants, from which obligations and recommendations can be derived regarding the shaping the final content of statements. The basic local (Polish) and international regulations are presented below.

Recommendations on how to conduct research are contained in the Code of Ethics for Sociologists, established in 2012 by the General Assembly of Delegates of the Polish Sociological Association. It is the largest association of academic researchers representing the discipline of sociology in Poland. It has existed since 1957 and has a legal personality. It operates on the basis of the 1989 Law on Associations and the 2003 Law on Public Benefit Activity and Volunteerism.

In the Code of Ethics for Sociologists of the Polish Sociological Association, two types of injunctions can be distinguished concerning empirical research: those relating to respecting the dignity of the respondent in general and those relating specifically to taking the respondent's wishes into account when conducting research. It is pointed out that "*Sociologists are obliged to ensure that the research they conduct does not have an adverse effect on the physical, social and psychological state of its participants. They should aim at protecting the rights of research participants, their interests, vulnerability, and privacy, even though balancing the competing interests may be difficult*" (point 7). A linguistic interpretation requires that researchers are obliged to protect not only the rights of research participants, but also their well-being in other non-legal aspects. It should be noted that the wording concerning the "interests, vulnerability, and privacy" of respondents is mentioned separately, alongside the protection of their rights, i.e. it is not included in the rights protected by legal standards. This protection goes beyond legal standards, offering additional security during research. *In addition, p*oint 8 states that "*In the relations with research participants, sociologists should behave with honesty, in a responsible, impartial, and trustworthy manner*". Furthermore, point 9 and point 12 of the Code are relevant from the perspective of authorisation and shaping the content of statements. Attention is drawn to the possibility for the interviewee to withdraw from the study at any time and to the obligation to explain in detail how the study results will be disseminated ("*Participation in sociological research should be based on the voluntary and informed consent of the respondents. The sociologist is obliged to explain, in words understandable to the respondents, what the research is about, who is conducting it and how the results will be disseminated and used. The respondents should be informed of their right to refuse to participate in the study and their right to withdraw from the study at any stage of the study, without giving any reason. Separate and explicit consent should be obtained for the use of audio and video recording. The interviewer should inform the respondent of his or her rights under data protection legislation and, where applicable, copyright legislation*." – paragraph 9). It is recommended to explain to respondents in advance whether respondents can withdraw or change the content of their statements ("*Researchers should clarify whether, and if so, to what extent respondents can have access to the interviews and observation notes and change their content, withdraw statements, introduce additional information and add comments or interpretations*." – paragraph 12).

On the other hand, the Code of Ethics for Academic Researchers of the Polish Academy of Sciences was passed by the General Assembly of the Polish Academy of Sciences. The current version of these regulations is the version adopted in December 2024, while other versions of the same text existed in earlier years. The adoption of the new version of the code was preceded by an extensive consultation

procedure, including consultations with universities and institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences, as well as circles of key importance to Polish science (such as the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland – CRASP). The regulations of the Code were prepared by members of the Committee for Ethics in Science operating at the Polish Academy of Sciences, appointed for a three-year term. The regulations of the Code of Ethics for Academic Researchers of the Polish Academy of Sciences stipulate that "*Research involving humans should be conducted with respect for human dignity and the autonomy of each research participant should be protected, ensuring that the individual's participation in the research is voluntary*." (§ 12). A linguistic interpretation of this provision indicates that every research participant should be treated individually. For example, obtaining collective consent (during meetings such as focus groups) without separately informing and asking for consent from individual research participants would not meet this condition. The norms of the Code also point out the need to obtain the informed consent of the respondent and provide for the possibility of withdrawing this consent: "*A condition for acceptance of research on human subjects is the informed consent of a research participant, or their statutory representative, to participate in research, and respecting their right to withdraw consent to participate at any time, without any negative consequences. In the case of underage participants researchers should obtain their assent as appropriate to their age and maturity*." (§ 13).

Ethical regulations at the European Union level, on the other hand, are formulated more generally and do not provide for interference by respondents in the final content of a sociological interview. Instead, the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023) generally provides that research participants should be treated with respect and informed about the research ("*Researchers inform research participants about how their data will be used, reused, accessed, stored, and deleted, in compliance with the GDPR*" – 2.3.). The Code also stipulates in section 2.4 that researchers should handle participants and related data in accordance with binding legal provisions and ethical principles. Researchers should also recognise and weigh potential problems and risks relating to their research and mitigate possible adverse impacts (2.4.). Systemic interpretation of ethical norms emphasises references to generally applicable legal norms contained in ethical codes of conduct. This means that these norms, established by states in a highly formalised and democratic law-making procedure, are considered fundamental to understanding, interpreting, and applying ethical norms, which are lower-level regulations (see also Andrejuk 2014). On the other hand, it should be noted that ethical provisions do not refer to the Press Law, and this law (which introduces an obligation for journalists to authorise interviews) does not refer to scientific activity.

Also at the European Union level, the document Ethics in Social Science and Humanities (2021) was produced. It was prepared by experts at the request of the European Commission – Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. However, it does not have the status of an official document, but proposes guidelines for researchers. Nevertheless, it is an example of a framework of supranational importance, setting supranational standards for academic work. According to this document, researchers are responsible for ensuring the protection of the physical, social and psychological well-being of respondents/interviewees/other participants during research, regardless of the type of ethics approval procedure that specific research undergoes (ESSH 2021: 22). The document notes that the guidelines for social researchers derive from ethical regulations originally aimed at the biomedical sciences (the Nuremberg Code, the Helsinki Declaration, the Belmont Report). This may be the reason why issues such as the relationship with the researcher during the interview and controlling the content of the message are shaped along the lines of a researcher-patient relationship rather than an interaction similar to a journalistic interview. The document lists the main principles that should shape the behaviour of researchers when conducting social research. They stipulate an obligation to honour respondents' autonomy and "*obtaining free* and informed consent (as well as assent whenever relevant)" (ESSH 2021: 6). Other principles address related issues and ensure that the needs of research participants are respected: respecting the integrity and dignity of human participants; protecting the vulnerability of participants; safeguarding honesty and transparency towards participants; encouraging justice and social inclusivity; safeguarding privacy and confidentiality; minimising harm; sharing the benefits of research with disadvantaged communities; protecting the environment and future generations (ESSH 2021: 6).

In the Statement of Ethical Practice (2017) published by the British Sociological Association there are several recommendations of significance to the issue of obtaining an authorisation. First of all, in the section "Consent", in point 19 we find the following statement: "*It should also be borne in mind that in some research contexts, especially those involving field research, it may be necessary for the obtaining of consent to be regarded, not as a once-and-for-all prior event, but as a process, subject to renegotiation over time*". In the section "Anonymity and Confidentiality", point 28 provides the following instruction: "*Researchers should clarify whether – and, if so, to what extent – research participants are allowed to see transcripts of interviews and field notes and to alter the content, withdraw statements, provide additional information or add glosses on interpretations*." Also, point 35 in the Distribution and Publication of Research reads: "*Clarification should be given to research participants regarding the degree to which they will be consulted prior to publication. Where possible, participants should be offered feedback on findings, for example in the form of a summary report*". It is clear

that the issue of post-interview or repeated consent has been given thought by the British Sociological Association, and the recommendations included in the Statement could provide a point of reference for developing a good practice model for the context of Poland.

Analysis of ethical codes shows that they often contain general clauses: deliberately vague concepts, intended to be interpreted by the addressees. General clauses are highly general phrases, which means that their interpretation should take into account the contemporary social, political, and religious context, moral values, customs, and the commonly shared understanding of moral concepts (Patti 2014; Liżewski 2016; Leszczyński 2022; Baran 2023). In codes of ethics, such concepts include, for example, norms about "the dignity of human participants" and behaving "with honesty, in a responsible, impartial, and trustworthy manner." Such concepts give ethical standards a certain level of flexibility, but their understanding may vary among individual researchers. This leads to the conclusion that provisions relating to authorisation, but not explicitly using this term, are characterised by a certain degree of interpretative freedom: they can be understood differently in different countries, academic circles, or disciplines. Regulations with general clauses may better cover a variety of factual situations in different jurisdictions, but they are also open to different interpretations: they will not always be understood in the same way.

## NUANCES AND POSSIBLE EXTENT OF ACADEMIC "AUTHORISATION"

A functional approach to interpreting norms requires consideration of the aims, objectives, functions, and context of the implementation of specific rules and certain legal institutions (Kisilowska 2023: 72), in this case – the principles of research work. In academic work, unlike journalistic work, authorisation is not envisaged on the same terms as expected for press interviews. However, there are well-established ethical principles and good practices that relate to the various powers of interviewees to control post-factum the content and form of their statements. Their nature and grounding in professional ethics justify talking about academic authorisation specific to research. However, it is in the nature of an ethical rather than a legal requirement. According to the ethical codes, the directive shaping the behaviour towards interlocutors should be respect for their dignity. The general nature of ethical directives means that they should be appropriately adapted to the context, status and situation of the interlocutor.

Firstly, a basic principle of most sociological research is the confidentiality of information and the anonymisation of interviews – as far as this is possible for a particular study (see for example: Joseph 2023; Lancaster 2017; Kaiser 2009; Wiles, Crow, Heath, Charles 2008). Respondents have the right to expect that

their narratives will not contain data that identifies them (name, surname, personal details). The primary reason for the introduction of *autoryzacja* into the press laws of some countries was precisely to be able to attribute certain statements to identified individuals whose identities are known to readers and other audiences. In social research, as a rule, it is not a matter of attributing a statement (or an entire narrative) to a specific interviewee, but of showing a sociological phenomenon on the basis of empirical material. Personal data is not collected from the interviewees at all or the statements of the interviewees are quoted after the removal of such data. The aim is not to describe a specific individual, but to analyse a phenomenon that is represented by the experiences, views and attitudes of that individual. Therefore, authorisation is not required in principle. This approach seems to be broadly accepted in qualitative research across various disciplines of social sciences (see e.g. Gałęziowski, Urbanek 2017). However, some exceptions may be made to this rule, in particular if the individual is interviewed by name, for example by officially communicating the views of a certain entity (for example, a state institution) as part of the study. Another example is biographical interviews, where the detail and abundance of personal information may lead to easy identification of the interviewee, even if the basic principles of anonymisation, i.e. removing the name and other proper names from the content, are followed. Biographical interviews often deal with important historical events ("oral history"), and when interviewing people with significant roles in the event, they may carry all the more risk of identifying the person in question, even against their wishes. In some publications of research results, names are deliberately retained due to the specific nature of the subject (see for example a portrait of artistic circles, Szenajch 2022): this practice also justifies accommodating any requests for authorisation made by respondents. Social researchers from certain subdisciplines (e.g. Kaźmierska 2024) indicate a choice between anonymisation, which is typical for most subdisciplines of sociology, and providing the first and last names of respondents, which gives them subjectivity and is perceived as emphasizing their individuality and dignity. In such cases (providing full respondent data), there are more arguments in favour of authorisation. Any requests for authorisation in such cases should be complied with by researchers.

Secondly, the scope of authorisation is negotiable. It can be subject to arrangements at the pre-interview stage. This is due to the various rights mentioned and described in the interview consent form. At the pre-interview stage, respondents should be made aware of their rights to interfere with the content of their statements. This scope constitutes the area of possible future interference by respondents in the empirical content.

Thirdly, interference by respondents does not, as a rule, imply modification of statements, but their deletion. Respecting the will of research participants implies

the possibility of both refusing to answer a selected question and withdrawing consent to use the empirical material collected in the interview. The latter can be done at least until the interview is anonymised. Once identifying data has been removed from the content of the interview, interference with the content of the empirical material would of course make it difficult to match a particular interview with a particular interviewee. In some cases, even after anonymisation, this may be possible, especially if the research project is conducted by a single researcher and the narratives, however anonymised, are linked to a particular unique situation (e.g. a specific professional position).

Fourthly, in the process of academic authorisation, it is important to distinguish between quoting statements verbatim and including statements in the process of analysing research material. Objections to the use of specific statements can be reconciled with the desire for accurate reporting of collected narratives by not quoting them verbatim or linking them to any particular respondent. However, an awareness of these statements can provide the researcher with, for example, interpretive guidance on how to understand the entirety of a particular interview or how to understand the social phenomenon under investigation. It can also be a methodological clue, prompting explanations as to why other interviewees, when asked about similar issues, avoid answering or give evasive answers. In this sense, the reason for the respondent's willingness to withdraw or change their statements is also relevant. Determining this (as far as possible) can shape the follow-up. On the one hand, the reason for withdrawal may be the perception of an error or untruth and the desire to correct it. In this situation, the withdrawal of the statement is necessary to ensure the integrity of the material collected. On the other hand, a research participant may seek to withdraw a statement because, for example, they do not want it to be identified with them or it is an embarrassing or controversial issue. In this situation, the removal of a statement from a particular interview does not change the fact that a particular narrative may provide some guidance and context for a better understanding of the situation under investigation. The issue of authorisation reveals paradoxes and pitfalls associated with respondents' self-correction of their own statements and ensuring the "authenticity" of empirical material: on the one hand, correcting factual errors can lead to a better understanding of phenomena, but on the other hand, mistakes can also be meaningful and subject to interesting interpretations. Some authorisations do not serve to correct factual inaccuracies, but rather to create a more positive, idealised self-representation of respondents. This could adversely affect the quality of research material.

Fifthly, the results of academic research are not only academic publications, but also collections of empirical material stored in academic archives. Archiving research is increasingly seen as a duty of sociologists, which guarantees more transparency and possibility to reuse data, but it comes with new challenges

and pitfalls (Corti 2012; Bornat, Bytheway 2012). The archiving of interviews in publicly accessible sociological data archives offers more opportunities (or risks) to identify interviewees than the quoting of some parts of an interview in an academic article or monograph. In this sense, full archiving more closely resembles a publicly available interview given to the mass media. Therefore, archiving interviews should be done with caution and with limited access to identifying or sensitive data. Alternatively, in a situation of full archiving with names and surnames of interviewees, it seems advisable to obtain a separate consent from the respondent or even a separate authorisation. It has to be remembered, however, that authorisation of an interview would prevent the audio recording from being stored in the public academic archive, because of modifications made in the interview transcript by a respondent.

Sixthly, in journalism, authorisation is necessary because journalists abbreviate statements and rewrite them for news texts, which makes quotations prone to distortion. As indicated in the ECHR judgment in the case Wizerkaniuk (Application no. 18990/05, judgment of 5.07.2011), the objective of authorisation is to safeguard citizens' right to reliable information, and it should "*ensure the veracity of the message, whereas statements published without authorisation could be distorted, which was clearly undesirable*." (par. 23). The threat of distortion is minimised in research material which is quoted without any edits. In qualitative academic research, it is customary and the norm to quote interviewees by accurately reproducing their statements (even if they contain errors), which mitigates the potential for misrepresentation. Any editing of statements by researchers, whether in academic publications or during archiving, is incorrect and against the rules of the art. The risk of altering the meaning of a statement may arise at the level of interpretation, but not at the level of citation. Therefore, academic authorisation is not as vital.

Finally, we have to make a methodological caveat. The issue of authorising statements arises mainly in relation to qualitative research, but it is not an irrelevant issue in quantitative (survey) research. Quantitative researchers are bound by the same codes of professional ethics and are therefore obliged to respect the will of respondents to the same extent. Methodological issues are a problem, i.e. the need to obtain comparable responses across the entire survey sample. Correcting statements after some time is a violation of a standardised procedure identical for all respondents. Studies show that even differentiating surveys according to whether they are conducted face to face or via an online survey leads to different answers from respondents. Even more so, issues of authorisation by changing answers could fundamentally distort the distribution of responses and the reliability of the results. Therefore, alternative ways of providing respondents control over their own statements should be proposed, such as removing the particular survey

questionnaire in its entirety from the sample or deleting answers to individual questions (prior to anonymisation). This would be in line with scientific ethics. It is possible that it would increase the costs of conducting the research through, for example, higher costs for survey record-keeping.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Analysis of researchers' potential duty to authorise interviews addresses one of the fundamental issues of sociological research: the extent of control that respondents have over the data they provide. Unlike journalistic (printed) interviews, the obligation to authorise interviews conducted as part of academic research does not originate from the law. Nor is it required by the ethics regulations applicable to sociologists. Social researchers do not have legal or ethical obligations comparable to mandatory journalistic authorisation. The issue of authorisation in academic research is related to the problems of respondents' anonymity and ensuring confidentiality of personal data. Statements quoted in academic texts reporting the results of qualitative research are usually anonymised, which removes the problem of attributing unauthorised statements to specific individuals. Some interference by the respondent in the content of the collected empirical material may be justified, but this applies to cases where participants do not appear anonymously and can be easily identified. Apart from this, an acceptable type of interference in a survey is a request to remove an interview or other form of information from the research database or archive.

This discussion about authorisation in academic research highlights the differences between direct quotation from identified interviewees and the use of empirical material from academic interviews in other ways. Authorisation as understood in press law refers to the citation of verbatim statements.

However, social researchers use interviews in various ways (not only via direct citations), in order to describe in a more in-depth manner, better understand and explain a social phenomenon. Qualitative interviews are not only used by direct quotations of respondents' narratives. They are also used to build up scientific explanations and, in this respect, it is not possible to derive a duty of authorisation from ethical rules. On the contrary, it is the ethical duty of the researcher to explain a phenomenon comprehensively, and ignoring and omitting certain aspects (even if wished by the respondents) can be considered insufficient scientific diligence.

It should be emphasised that ethical standards for social researchers historically derive from standards for life science researchers, rather than from legal regulations applicable to journalists. Furthermore, they do not derive from the standards applicable in Central and Eastern Europe (where the obligation to obtain authorisation originated), but from codes of conduct in Anglo-Saxon academic

environment. When analysing the possibility of research participants' interference in the completed interview, it should be interpreted from the perspective and in the context of general principles of ethical behaviour towards respondents, respecting their will and dignity. When considering authorisation, a key guideline seems to be the principle of proportionality: researchers must balance the interests of respondents on the one hand with the desire to comprehensively describe and explain the phenomenon under study on the other.

## FUNDING

This research is funded in whole by the National Science Centre, Poland, project registration number: 2023/50/O/HS6/00090 (Preludium Bis).

## REFERENCES

Allmark P., Boote J., Chambers E., Clarke A., Mcdonnell A., Thompson A. & Tod A.M. (2009). Ethical issues in the use of in-depth interviews: literature review and discussion. *Research Ethics Review*, 5(2), 48–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/174701610900500203

Andrejuk, K. (2024). Funkcjonowanie komisji etyki badań naukowych w warunkach dywersyfikacji struktur i norm–perspektywa neoinstytucjonalna, *Studia Socjologiczne*, 251(4), 123–144. https://doi.org/10.24425/sts.2023.148177

Andrejuk, K. (2014). Prawne i etyczne aspekty archiwizacji badań socjologicznych, *Studia Socjologiczne* 214(3), 203–220.

Bałaban, A. (2024). Metody badawcze w naukach prawnych–bieżące refleksje, *Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego*, 4, 117–127. https://doi.org/10.15804/ppk.2024.04.09

Baran, K. (2023). General Clauses and the Abuse of Subjective Right in the Polish Labor Code, *Law & Social Bonds*, 3(46). https://doi.org/10.36128/PRIW.VI46.703

Bornat, J., Bytheway, B. (2012). Working with different temporalities: archived life history interviews and diaries, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15(4), 291–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2012.688312

Corti, L. (2012). Recent developments in archiving social research, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15(4), 281–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2012.688310

Gałeziowski, J., Urbanek, J. (2017). „Etyczny zwrot" w polskiej historii mówionej, *Wrocławski Rocznik Historii Mówionej*, 7: 7–34. https://doi.org/10.26774/wrhm.165

Gizbert-Studnicki, T. (2013). Pozytywistyczny park jurajski [Jurassic Park of Positivism]. *Forum Prawnicze*, 50–59.

Hammersley M., Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in Qualitative Research: Controversies and Contexts*. *SAGE Publications Ltd*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957619

Hart, S. M., Pascucci, M., Sood, S. &Barrett, E. M. (2020). Value, Vulnerability and Voice: An Integrative Review on Research Assent. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 48(2), 154–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/bld.12309

Hedgecoe A. (2008). Research ethics review and the sociological research relationship. *Sociology*, 42(5), 873–886. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508094567

Joseph, P. (2023). 'It's All Public Anyway': A Collaborative Navigation of Anonymity and Informed Consent in a Study with Identifiable Parent Carers. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 17(2), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2023.2206671

Kaiser, K. (2009). Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11): 1632–1641. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309350879

Kaźmierska, K. (2024). Anonymisation in biographical research – methodological and ethical concerns. *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 73(4), 87–108. https://doi.org/10.26485/PS/2024/73.4/4

Kijańska, K. (2025). Wolność Zrzeszania się a Zrównoważony Rozwój. *Roczniki Administracji i Prawa*, 1(XXV), 69–78. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0055.1096

Kisilowska, H. (2023). Metodologia nauk prawnych a identyfikacja wartości w publicznym prawie gospodarczym. *Przegląd Prawno-Ekonomiczny*, 2. https://doi.org/10.31743/ppe.14562

Lancaster, K. (2017). Confidentiality, anonymity and power relations in elite interviewing: conducting qualitative policy research in a politicised domain. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(1), 93–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2015.1123555

Lewandowska, I. (2009), Zasady opisu bibliograficznego źródeł mówionych (relacji ustnych). Próba systematyzacji. *Echa Przeszłości*, 10, 487–498.

Leszczyński, L. (2022). Konstytucyjne klauzule generalne – między konstrukcją legislacyjną a jej implementacją. *Archiwum Filozofii Prawa i Filozofii Społecznej*, 1(30), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.36280/AFPiFS.2022.1.44

Liżewski, B. (2016). Klauzule generalne i ich funkcje w Europejskiej Konwencji Praw Człowieka. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska*, LXIII(2), 191–207. https://doi.org/10.17951/g.2016.63.2.191

Męcfal, S. (2020). Analiza praktyk anonimizacji danych w polskich jakościowych badaniach socjologicznych na tle literatury przedmiotu oraz zasad etyczno-prawnych. *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 69(3), 59–84. https://doi.org/10.26485/PS/2020/69.3/3

Ossowska-Salamonowicz, D. (2012). Autoryzacja musi zniknąć? Konsekwencje orzeczenia w sprawie Wizerkaniuk przeciwko Polsce. *Studia Prawnoustrojowe*, 17, 53–67.

Patti, S. (2014). Interpretation of the General Clauses 'Public Policy' and 'Good Morals' in European Contract Law. *European Review of Private Law*, 22(5), 611–617. https://doi.org/10.54648/erpl2014052

Szenajch, P. (2022). *Odczarowanie talentu. Socjografia stawania się uznanym artystą*. Łódź, Uniwersytet Łódzki. https://doi.org/10.18778/8220-866-5

Wiles, R., Crow, G., Heath, S. & Charles, V. (2008). The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 11(5), 417–428. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570701622231

**Ethical and legal regulations:**

Code of Ethics for Sociologists of the Polish Sociological Association (2012) (Kodeks Etyki Socjologa PTS),

Code of Ethics for Academic Researchers of the Polish Academy of Sciences (2024), by the General Assembly of the Polish Academy of Sciences. (Kodeks Etyki Pracownika Naukowego PAN),

The European Court of Human Rights, case Wizerkaniuk v. Poland (Application no. 18990/05, judgment of 5.07.2011),

European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023),

Ethics in Social Science and Humanities (ESSH 2021), by European Commission - DG Research and Innovation,

Statement of Ethical Practice (2017) by the British Sociological Association,

Polish Press Law (Ustawa z dnia 26 stycznia 1984 r. Prawo prasowe).