

Psychology and ethics from the perspective of the philosophy of science

Arina Nur Hikmah

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Sálua Omais

University of São Paulo, Brazil

Corresponding Author: arinanurhikmah10@gmail.com

Abstract

The relationship between psychology and ethics is a fundamental concern in the philosophy of science, particularly in understanding how scientific knowledge is generated, validated, and applied in research and professional practice. This study examines the interplay between psychology and ethics from a philosophy-of-science perspective through a Narrative Literature Review (NLR). We identified relevant scholarly publications through targeted searches of academic databases. We critically synthesized the literature to identify perspectives on ethics in psychological science, research, and professional practice. The findings indicate that ethics provides a normative framework for responsible scientific inquiry by strengthening research integrity, enhancing scientific objectivity, and supporting ethical decision-making. Ethics promotes relational responsibility, moral reflection, and experiential learning in addressing complex ethical dilemmas encountered in psychological research and practice. The review also suggests that professional experience contributes to the development of ethical judgment, highlighting the importance of continuous ethics education and reflective practice throughout psychologists' careers. Integrating psychological perspectives with ethical principles within the philosophy of science is therefore essential for advancing scientifically rigorous, socially responsible, and humanistic psychological knowledge.

Keywords: Ethics, Philosophy of Science, Psychology.

Introduction

Historically, philosophy and psychology have had intertwined intellectual roots, particularly in the quest to explain human thought processes, consciousness, and actions. The relationship matters because psychology involves not only scientific activities but also moral decisions that directly affect the well-being of individuals and society. Recently, there has been an impulse to expand psychology's philosophical foundations to better account for the ethical, existential, and social dimensions that shape human experience (King et al., 2021).

Philosophy provides the conceptual foundation that connects the two disciplines by offering a reflective framework for freedom, responsibility, character, and moral values. From the development of existential philosophy to the emergence of humanistic psychology, the focus has shifted from seeing human beings as objects of scientific study to seeing them as subjects who can choose, interpret experiences, and take responsibility for their actions (Chesnokova, 2017).

Ethics asks what is good and right, while psychology describes how individuals shape moral judgment, develop character, and make decisions in everyday life. The humanistic perspective asserts that ethical values evolve through interactions between individuals, societies, and the historical contexts that shape human experience (Li & Carleo, 2023). In this development, ethics serves as a normative dimension that guides how knowledge should be used and which goals are worth pursuing through scientific activities. Integrating these three fields shows that science is not only concerned with fact-finding but also with values, moral responsibility, and philosophical reflection on the social consequences of the knowledge it generates (Capaldi & Proctor, 2012; Kargopoulos, 2023). Therefore, the study of psychology, ethics, and philosophy of science helps explain how humans build knowledge and determine actions considered right in the context of individuals and society.

The study of ethics in psychology cannot be separated from the philosophical roots that shape science's development. As psychology becomes an increasingly empirical scientific discipline, the need for a strong ethical framework grows to ensure the pursuit of knowledge remains respectful of human dignity and well-being. In this context, ethics serves not only as a set of professional rules but also as a critical reflection on the values that underlie the production and use of psychological knowledge (Walsh, 2015). In addition, society's increasingly complex development, including advances in digital technology and globalization, is driving new ethical challenges that demand ongoing dialogue between philosophy, psychology, and professional practice (Banyard & Flanagan, 2025).

Psychology and ethics play an important role in understanding how scientific knowledge is produced, validated, and practiced. Ideally, science is a rational activity grounded in objectivity, moral integrity, and ethical responsibility for the common good. However, in practice, scientific activities, especially in psychology, are often colored by the tension between the demands of scientific objectivity and the reality of the moral subjectivity of researchers, the power relationship with participants, and the social implications of the knowledge generated (Hopner & Liu, 2021).

The scientific process is often influenced by psychological factors such as emotions, self-interest, cognitive bias, and scientists' moral dispositions, which can give rise to ethical issues such as data manipulation, breaches of academic integrity, and distortion of scientific communication (Sánchez-Chero et al., 2023). Research on virtue ethics and moral identity shows boundary issues between normative ethics and moral psychology, which require conceptual integration to understand moral behavior more comprehensively (Jeong & Han, 2013). Moral decision-making is inseparable from complex psychological mechanisms, so ethical reflection needs to consider empirical data on how humans think and act (Green, 2015).

In the philosophy of science, it also highlights that the formation of scientific beliefs has broad moral consequences, especially in public discourse, scientific knowledge production, and decision-making, thus demanding greater accuracy and responsibility from the scientific community (Torcello, 2016). One central theme in recent research is that the validity of knowledge depends not only on outcomes but also on how it is generated and used (Hopner & Liu, 2021).

However, a research gap remains. Interdisciplinary approaches that combine philosophical analysis and psychological data have often not been methodologically articulated within the philosophy of science (Zahorodna, 2021). In addition, the philosophy of

science has not fully developed a conceptual framework that systematically bridges empirical psychological data with ethical analysis of scientific practice and scientists' moral responsibility (Gómez Tabares et al., 2019). This gap also appears in professional education and training, where ethics, philosophy of science, and psychology are often taught separately, leaving students without a complete reflective understanding of the moral and psychological dimensions of scientific practice (Kordahl & Fougner, 2017). Ethics in psychology and science are often practiced procedurally and hierarchically, while ethical dimensions that emphasize reciprocity, moral sensitivity, and common purpose have not been adequately integrated within the framework of philosophy of science and research practice (Hopner & Liu, 2021).

Based on these problems, this study aims to examine, conceptually and philosophically, the relationship between psychology and ethics in the philosophy of science. This study is expected to add value to the development of philosophy of science, especially by strengthening the understanding of science as a rational human practice that is also psychologically and ethically charged.

Methods

Reviewing and synthesizing various relevant scientific literature regarding the relationship between psychology, ethics, and philosophy, the selection of this method is based on the theoretical consideration that conceptual and philosophical studies require an in-depth analysis of ideas, theories, and the results of previous research in order to build a comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon (Farrukh & Saj, 2023). Through a literature search on various reputable academic sources, the Narrative Literature Review (NLR) was chosen because the topics studied are conceptual, multidisciplinary, and develop through various theoretical perspectives that are not easily integrated through a rigid systematic approach. A narrative literature review allows researchers to explore ideas, arguments, and developments in the literature more flexibly, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Pittman, 2023). The research subjects include reputable journal articles and scientific proceedings relevant to the study topic. Library sources are selected based on the following criteria: (1) published in reputable journals or trusted academic publishers, (2) explicitly discussing psychology, ethics, and philosophy of science, and (3) published within the last 15 years to maintain the relevance of scientific development. The selection process involves screening titles and abstracts, followed by full-text review to ensure alignment with the research focus.

This study uses the Narrative Literature Review (NLR), which aims to provide an interpretive understanding and conception of a phenomenon by integrating findings from various theoretical and empirical sources so that relevant concepts, perspectives, and findings can be contextualised in broader scientific discussions (Ferrari, 2015; Theile & Beall, 2024). Relevant publications were identified through a targeted search based on academic databases, including Scopus, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar, using keywords related to the research objective. The selection process prioritises the most recent published articles that contribute to the conceptual and empirical development of the topic. Furthermore, the literature is analysed through thematic and critical synthesis, interpreting key concepts, theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, and key findings. The selected literature is then analysed and critically interpreted to identify disagreements, emerging trends, and

research deviations. This approach supports a comprehensive narrative that includes previous research while also generating critical insights and guiding future studies (Ferrari, 2015; Theile & Beall, 2024; Ahmad, 2025).

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The literature review shows several findings that explain the relationship between ethics, psychology, and philosophy. First, empathy is a fundamental element that connects psychological experience with moral judgment; individuals' ability to understand and reflect on others' experiences underpins the emergence of authentic moral dispositions (Fabbianelli, 2021). Second, research in moral psychology reveals that moral behavior is influenced by the interaction between individual character and situational factors. This perspective expands on the traditional view of virtue ethics, which emphasizes character as the primary source of moral action, by showing that social context also significantly influences ethical behavior (Hu, 2025).

Furthermore, the concept of practical wisdom rooted in Aristotelian philosophy places character and moral will as the main factors in ethical action. However, modern psychology shows that moral behavior is not determined only by rational principles; it is also influenced by an individual's emotions, intuition, and life experiences (Schwartz, 2022). Similar to this opinion, research in cognitive and moral psychology has found that ethical decision-making is not entirely based on rational reasoning, but is also influenced by emotions, intuition, and unconscious cognitive processes that shape an individual's moral judgment; morality cannot be understood through a logical approach alone (Bowie, 2009; Zahorodna, 2021).

The literature review also shows that psychological ethics from a philosophical perspective develops through an increasingly complex understanding of human morality. In professional practice and psychological research, various ethical principles such as confidentiality, respect for participant autonomy as the foundation of responsible scientific practice, informed consent, and prevention of conflicts of interest are fundamental aspects that must be maintained (Isaac, 2009; Rösler, 2019). Moral psychology explains that ethical norms not only serve as external rules but also shape the structure of an individual's motivations and emotional responses. Emotions such as shame, guilt, empathy, and responsibility become psychological mechanisms that connect moral values with real human actions (Prokofyev, 2021).

The principles of respect for participants' rights, scientific responsibility, and social justice, as well as aspects such as informed consent, data confidentiality, and intellectual property rights protection, are central issues in modern psychology research, especially in the midst of the development of digital technology and the globalization of ethical standards (Fahrudin & Fitriyana, 2024). Findings show that professional discussion and peer support influence ethical decision-making (Brzezinski, 2020). On the other hand, ethics education is understood not just as a transfer of normative rules, but as a dialogical process that forms moral awareness, social responsibility, and the ability to face complex ethical dilemmas (Laletas, 2019; Lucidi, 2021).

Psychological research operates not only within a methodological and procedural framework but also within ethical dimensions related to power relations, social inequality,

and epistemological risks to the individual and group being studied. Justice literature confirms that a purely legalistic and hierarchical approach to ethics is not enough to guarantee scientific justice, so relational ethics is needed to emphasize researchers' reciprocity, honesty, and moral responsibility regarding the impact of their knowledge (Hopner & Liu, 2021; Kaulino & Matus, 2021).

The literature also confirms that scientific practice is never value-free, as methodological decisions, data interpretation, and knowledge dissemination carry moral and social implications, including the risk of data manipulation and the impact of scientific findings on society at large (Sánchez-Chero et al., 2023). Therefore, relational ethics and virtue epistemology are important for positioning the scientific agent as the moral subject responsible for seeking truth (Fairweather, 2014; Hopner & Liu, 2021).

Findings in moral psychology show that situational and cognitive factors shape moral intuition and judgment, challenging ethical views based solely on internal intentions or normative rules. In this context, the ethics of belief emphasizes individuals' moral responsibility for forming and sharing knowledge, especially in public spaces where misinformation poses a serious risk (Torcello, 2016). This integration is also relevant in applied practices, such as mental health, where classical ethical principles need to be complemented by a more systemic and equitable ethical framework to guarantee the well-being of vulnerable individuals and groups (Young, 2016).

These findings show that psychology, ethics, and philosophy of science have interdependent relationships in building scientific practices that are not only methodologically valid but also morally responsible. Advancing science requires a balance between empirical rigor and ethical reflection so research results not only produce correct knowledge but also contribute to human well-being and the broader public interest (Savulescu, 2025). These findings indicate that psychological ethics cannot be understood simply as a set of professional rules, but rather as a philosophical reflection on moral responsibility in understanding and influencing human behavior.

Ethical education for aspiring psychologists needs to be designed not only to improve understanding of the code of ethics, but also to develop moral sensitivity, reflective abilities, and awareness of the social impact of their professional practice (Korkut, 2020). In this context, psychological ethics can be understood as a space for dialogue between philosophy and psychological science that aims to ensure that the development of psychological knowledge and services remains oriented towards respect for human dignity, justice, and social welfare (Oppong et al., 2022).

From a philosophical perspective, the relationship between psychology and ethics shows that understanding human beings cannot be reduced to observable biological or behavioral aspects. The relational approach in contemporary psychology emphasizes that knowledge and moral action develop through social interactions that involve respect for human dignity, shared responsibility, and ethical awareness in relationships between individuals (Hopner & Liu, 2021).

In addition, the increasing complexity of psychological research and practice demands an ethical understanding that goes beyond adherence to formal procedures and includes a critical awareness of the social, cultural, and humanitarian implications of professional action (Lucidi, 2021). Thus, the future of psychological ethics depends not only on refining

professional regulation, but also on academics' and practitioners' ability to foster open dialogue among philosophy, science, and diverse cultural values.

The findings also show that scientific objectivity depends not only on methodological rigor but also on researchers' psychological characteristics. Cognitive bias, including selective attention, confirmation bias, and biased interpretations of evidence, along with emotional states, can affect how researchers formulate questions, interpret data, and draw conclusions. Although emotions have traditionally been considered a threat to scientific neutrality, contemporary perspectives recognize that they also stimulate curiosity, creativity, motivation, and innovative thinking, all of which are important drivers of scientific discovery (Kozlov, 2023).

In this context, research ethics plays an important role in maintaining scientific validity by promoting transparency, honesty, accountability, and responsible research practices throughout the research process. Ethical principles encourage researchers to critically examine their assumptions, disclose potential conflicts of interest, use rigorous methodologies, and report findings accurately regardless of whether they support initial expectations (Adjovi, 2025).

Researchers' psychological characteristics throughout the scientific process can also affect scientific objectivity. Cognitive biases, such as selective attention, confirmation bias, and subjective interpretation of evidence, can unconsciously shape how researchers formulate hypotheses, evaluate data, and draw conclusions, while emotions can also serve as a source of potential bias and an important driver of scientific inquiry. Rather than harming research, emotions can increase curiosity, perseverance, creativity, and motivation, and support scientific innovation when appropriately regulated (Araújo et al., 2017). In this context, research ethics is a fundamental mechanism for maintaining scientific validity by establishing principles of honesty, transparency, accountability, and methodological integrity throughout the research process. Ethical standards, supported by peer review, institutional ethics committees, and responsible research governance, protect against psychological bias by encouraging rigorous study design, objective data analysis, transparent reporting, and disclosure of potential conflicts of interest (Adjovi, 2025).

Codes of ethics developed by international psychological organizations, such as those in America and Canada, emerged through a long process of dialogue to balance respect for the individual, professional responsibility, and broader social interests (Pettifor et al., 2005). The ethical decision-making model in psychology indicates that moral reasoning involves the interaction between a rapid intuitive process and a more deliberative, reflective process, so moral decisions result from integrating affective and cognitive aspects (Young, 2016).

Ethics considers good and bad actions and immorality in human relationships. Ethics and morals differ. Morality focuses on assessing an action or deed; it can also refer to a teaching system about good and bad values. Ethics is an in-depth study of the existing value system. Norms are values a society embraces, embedded in deep emotions and shaped by mutual agreement. Science must not abandon its philosophical foundation. This philosophical foundation ensures science remains scientific at its core. Ethics, as a branch of philosophy, guides the advancement of knowledge to benefit humans (Wilujeng, 2013).

Psychology examines human behavior and mental processes to improve human life. Psychology is grounded in science and practice (applicative) and can benefit people. In

scientific practice, practitioners need ethics so their work does not violate basic moral values. Moral standards in professional settings are known as ethics (Denadia & Ediyono, 2022). Moral values in life, both between individuals and society, become the rules of human behavior (etiquette) and are then studied as science (knowledge). Ethics can also be the principles of a group of people in work (profession) or known as the principles of a code of ethics (Siregar, 2015; Ningsih & Urbayatun, 2021).

Professional ethics regulate members' behavior. A code of ethics is a set of moral principles that govern professional behavior (Abadi, 2016). Because the psychology profession provides services that require direct contact with clients, psychologists must, in addition to respecting the scientific code of ethics and professional ethical principles, protect science to preserve its existence, support its growth, and benefit society. Psychologists must also protect science practitioners so they can grow and develop professionally. Furthermore, psychologists must protect clients from harm and safeguard their rights (Kirana, 2020).

This code of ethics will help all parties feel comfortable and protected when using the services of the psychology profession. Ethics provides standards and boundaries that govern human interaction with the environment and its social groups. The professional code of ethics serves as a guideline, foundation, and direction for the attitudes, behaviors, and actions of a professional group, regulating its members so they can practice properly and correctly. A code of ethics aims to protect against unprofessional actions (Denadia & Ediyono, 2022).

To build public trust and respect for the psychology profession, the community must work to improve psychological welfare for the entire community and uphold the values it upholds. As the only forum for the psychology community in Indonesia, HIMPSI has codified core moral values in the Indonesian Code of Ethics for Psychology, which serves as a self-regulatory standard for psychologists and psychological scientists. This aims to support service delivery to the community. The Psychological Code of Ethics essentially crystallizes universal moral values, so its preparation also considers international agreements (Himawan, 2016). A professional code of ethics helps ensure public trust that services will be delivered as intended. A code of ethics serves as a compass that shows a profession's moral direction while ensuring its moral quality in the public eye (Pedhu, 2020; Ningsih & Urbayatun, 2021).

Basically, the code of ethics was created to guide the application of science. Almost the entire content of Indonesia's psychological code of ethics regulates the application of psychological science, including education or training, assessment and intervention, psychoeducation, and psychological counseling and therapy. This moral context will require psychologists and psychological scientists to maintain the highest standards of ethical behavior (Muhiddin, 2014).

The Code of Ethics for Psychology includes principles and norms that guide psychologists' behavior in professional practice (Tiffany, 2018). The Psychological Code of Ethics aims to build a strong moral foundation that ensures every action and decision a psychologist makes is grounded in high ethical values. It also focuses on protecting clients and society. This code of conduct serves as a shield against unethical and harmful practices by setting standards of conduct that support clients' safety and well-being. Therefore, psychologists are expected to comply with certain prohibitions, such as engaging in unethical personal relationships with clients or providing practical advice outside their psychological scope. By affirming the principle of distributive justice, this code of ethics encourages

psychologists to provide services that respect justice and are free from discrimination, so that every individual has equal access to psychological help (Levitt & Lishner, 2016).

By setting high ethical standards, this code of ethics helps to build and maintain a positive reputation for the profession. By encouraging psychologists to practice competently and based on the latest knowledge, this code of ethics helps advance the field of psychology and positively impacts individuals, families, and society in general. Therefore, the Psychological Code of Ethics is not just an ethical guideline, but also an important tool for creating and maintaining trust and the quality of services provided by psychologists (Azzahra et al., 2023).

Discussion

Axiology is a branch of philosophy that examines the value and usefulness of knowledge and nature, disposition, and habits. The material object of ethics is behavior that is carried out consciously and freely, while the formal object of ethics is the moral and immoral aspects of behavior. Ethics is not about what or who a human being is, but how humans should act. Scientists have a responsibility to ensure that their scientific products reach the community and can be used optimally (Abadi, 2016).

Kant argued that the difference and superiority of human beings over other beings lies in their morals. Through morality, the individual finds the core of his humanity. Why are all human actions related to judgment, while this is not the case with other beings? Reason acts as a distinguishing factor, not just a means to establish the superiority of man over other beings. Reason, when applied correctly, can elevate humanity, but when abused, it can degrade humans to a lower level than animals. To ensure that human existence has meaning, moral strength is essential to regulate reason and desire. Humans must uphold moral and ethical standards because they are sentient creatures; all human deeds, actions, and words must be accounted for. The behavior of rational beings is constantly evaluated and monitored. Action is what gives human life meaning. All human actions in all fields are always subject to judgment. Man's actions are always judged, and he is always judged. Scientists carry out scientific activities under academic institutions and authorities that serve various interests, so values must guide them. Scientific ethics is needed so science continues to run in the right direction (Wilujeng, 2013).

The Psychology profession is theoretical and technical, grounded in honesty, and people who need assistance place high expectations on its practitioners; therefore, practitioners must carry out their professional duties and functions. The Code of Ethics serves as a means of social control, maintains the dignity of the profession, and protects the public from all forms of deviation or abuse of knowledge and expertise. Morality contains values and rules that provide a foundation and guidelines regarding what is right to do and what is wrong to avoid. The ethics of science itself is an application of moral values that provide benchmarks, measures, standards, procedures, and guidelines regarding things that should be done, recommended or prohibited to be done, so that the morality of science can be carried out by everyone who works with and in the framework of science (Kirana, 2020).

Every life needs ethics so moral values can be maintained. The relationship between ethics and science is a restriction that keeps human thoughts that thirst for truth within the norms that should be maintained. Professional ethics is a life attitude rooted in justice that

aims to provide professional services to the community in an orderly and professional manner, fulfilling obligations to the community (Ningsih & Urbayatun, 2021).

The tasks of the psychology profession rest on two legs that must be equally strong: the scientific leg and the practical (applicative) leg that directly benefits humanity. Psychology is a science that studies human behavior to improve human life (well-being); it must be accountable for its scientific side and, at the same time, bring useful benefits to the human life it serves.

A psychologist as a practitioner needs ethical guidance in his work and in serving his clients. This ethical guide is in the form of a psychological code of ethics, which contains guidelines that govern all psychologists and psychological scientists in attitudes and behaviors that will play an important role in the protection of human subjects, data manipulation, falsification, plagiarism, and other dishonest actions during research (Denadia & Ediyono, 2022).

The reasoning process that has produced science and technology has significantly improved human life. Ethics does not suggest that people act morally only; they must make decisions based on general reasons, whether they discourage or encourage good behavior, to avoid mental harm from individual violations of applicable ethics, and to help psychologists treat or handle patients more easily (Rahmawan, 2023).

Basically, the psychology profession aims to provide psychological services to people in need based on their knowledge and skills; therefore, there needs to be a guarantee that the person providing them can carry out these professional duties. Ethics provides limits and standards that govern human association within a social group. Ethics is described as written rules systematically and deliberately based on existing moral principles and, when needed, used to judge actions that logically deviate from the code of ethics (Kirana, 2020).

The moral principles of science must align with professional morality. The code of ethics disciplines scientific practice in accordance with the ethics of science and indicates the order of the discipline concerned. Strengthening the authority of the Psychology profession is built on expertise in the field of Psychology, which limits the influence of authority from communities outside psychology and establishes the value rules needed to improve the psychological welfare of humanity, especially Indonesian society. Strengthening the profession's power and recognition of its expertise in psychology will limit interference from parties outside the discipline.

This code of ethics reflects ongoing ethical reflection and remains flexible, adapting to the dynamics of social life so its values stay current. To gain public trust and, along with the growing appreciation of the psychology profession, it is necessary to ensure that the values created by the psychology community improve the psychological well-being of all mankind. For the purposes and objectives mentioned above, the Indonesian Psychological Association as the only forum for the psychology community in Indonesia, has collected core moral values in the form of the Indonesian Psychological Code of Ethics, which functions as a self-regulatory regulatory standard for psychologists and psychological scientists in providing services to the community (Kirana, 2020).

Integrating psychology and ethics enriches understanding of human morality, both theoretically and practically. Moral psychology and virtue ethics help explain the development of moral capacity throughout the lifespan, which is relevant to the philosophy of science and

how we understand knowledge (Jeong & Han, 2013; Prokofyev, 2021; Anam et al., 2026). More broadly, this integration affirms scientists' moral responsibility for the accuracy of knowledge and science's social impact, particularly in public issues and applied practice (Torcello, 2016). Thus, the relationship between psychology and ethics in the philosophy of science is not only conceptual but also a normative foundation that helps ensure scientific development aligns with human values and scientists' social responsibility (Sánchez-Chero et al., 2023).

An interdisciplinary approach allows ethics to be understood not solely as a set of rules, but as a reflective process rooted in the values, goals, and moral character of individuals and the scientific community (Lucidi, 2021). The findings on the influence of experience on ethical judgment confirm the importance of ongoing ethical education and training for psychologists to address moral dilemmas more thoroughly and responsibly. Thus, the relationship between psychology and ethics is dynamic and contextual, and the ongoing dialogue between empirical findings and normative reflection becomes a key foundation for building psychological practices that are not only scientifically valid but also ethically meaningful and just.

Conclusion

This study examines the relationship between psychology and ethics within a philosophy of science framework to clarify how ethical principles contribute to generating and constructing scientific knowledge, validating it, and applying it in psychology. This review demonstrates that psychology and ethics are intrinsically intertwined, both at the epistemological level of knowledge production and at the practical level of research and professional practice. Ethical principles provide the necessary normative foundation to ensure that psychological knowledge is generated and applied responsibly. These findings suggest that ethics should be understood not simply as a regulatory mechanism for professional behavior but as a reflective and constitutive dimension of psychological science that strengthens scientific integrity, methodological rigor, and social accountability. Thus, advancing psychology requires integrating empirical evidence with ethical reflection to produce knowledge that is scientifically sound, humanistic, and socially responsible. Future research should expand this integrative perspective through empirical investigations of ethical decision-making, moral development, and professional judgment across diverse psychological contexts, thereby contributing to the ongoing development of ethical theory, psychological practice, and the philosophy of science.

References

- Abadi, T. W. (2016). Aksiologi: antara etika, moral, dan estetika. *Kanal: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 4(2), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.21070/kanal.v4i2.1452>
- Adjovi, I. S. M. (2025). A worldwide itinerary of research ethics in science for a better social responsibility and justice: a bibliometric analysis and review. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 10, 1504937. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2025.1504937>
- Ahmad, M. N. (2025). Narrative literature reviews in scientific research: pros and cons. *Jordan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 21(1).
- Akrivou, K., & Scalzo, G. (2020). In search of a fitting moral psychology for practical wisdom:

- Exploring a missing link in virtuous management. *Business Ethics a European Review*, 29(S1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12295>
- Anam, A. M., Acikgenc, A., MR, M. I. F., & Alwiyah, N. (2026). The dialectics of metacognition and spirituality: integrating self-regulated learning within the Islamic intellectual tradition. *Dialogium: Journal of Islamic Studies*, 1(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.21831/djis.v1i1.95873>
- Araújo, L. S., Cruz, J. F. A., & Almeida, L. S. (2017). Achieving scientific excellence: An exploratory study of the role of emotional and motivational factors. *High Ability Studies*, 28(2), 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2016.1264293>
- Azzahra, K. F., Adelya, L., Putri, M. A. V., Ridho, M., Kurniawan, N. Y. Z., & Ediyono, S. (2023). Berteman dengan klien: apakah melanggar kode etik psikologi?
- Banyard, P., & Flanagan, C. (2025). *Ethical issues in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003485162>
- Bowie, N. E. (2009). How empirical research in human cognition does and does not affect philosophical ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(S4), 635–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0309-4>
- Brzeziński, J. M. (2020). Basic problems of scientific research in psychology. *Health Psychology Report*, 8(4), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2020.97429>
- Capaldi, E. J., & Proctor, R. W. (2012). Psychology of science: influence on the philosophy of science. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 40–56). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199753628.003.0002>
- Chenneville, T., & Gardy, S. (2022). Ethics in mental health research. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 813–820). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-323-91497-0.00169-7>
- Chesnokova, M. G. (2017). Philosophy of psychology: from S. Kierkegaard to C. Rogers. *Voprosy Psikhologii*, (5), 52–+.
- Clemente, M., Espinosa, P., & Urrea, J. (2011). Ethical issues in psychologists' professional practice: Agreement over problematic professional behaviors among Spanish psychologists. *Ethics & Behavior*, 21(1), 13–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2011.537568>
- Deb, D., Dey, R., & Balas, V. E. (2019). Literature review and technical reading. In *Intelligent systems reference library* (pp. 9–21). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2947-0_2
- Del Giglio, A., & Da Costa, M. U. P. (2026). Utilizing artificial Intelligence to create narrative literature reviews. *Einstein (São Paulo)*, 24, eRW1165. https://doi.org/10.31744/einstein_journal/2026rw1165
- Denadia, F., & Ediyono, S. (2022). Hubungan etika dan ilmu psikologi berdasarkan perspektif filsafat.
- El Hafiz, S., & Himawan, K. K. (2021). The challenges of conducting literature review studies in Indonesia: fundamental issues and solutions. *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat*, 8(1), 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.24854/jpul25>
- Fahrudin, A., & Fitriyana, R. (2025). Research ethics in psychology. In *Ethics in Social Science Research: Current Insights and Practical Strategies* (pp. 55–65). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Fairweather, A. (2014). Bridges between virtue epistemology and philosophy of science. In

- Synthese Library/Synthese library* (pp. 1–9). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04672-3_1
- Farrukh, A., & Sajjad, A. (2023). A critical review of literature review methodologies. *Review of Management Literature*, 103–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s2754-5865202300000002006>
- Ferrari, R. (2015). Writing narrative-style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230–235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.0000000000329>
- Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0899-3467\(07\)60142-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0899-3467(07)60142-6)
- Han, H. (2014). Analysing theoretical frameworks of moral education through Lakatos's philosophy of science. *Journal of Moral Education*, 43(1), 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2014.893422>
- Himawan, K. K. (2021). The question of ethical review for psychological research in indonesia: need and importance [menyoal uji etik dalam penelitian psikologi di indonesia: seberapa perlu dan pentingkah?]. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 36(2), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v36i2.4059>
- Hopner, V., & Liu, J. H. (2021). Relational ethics and epistemology: The case for complementary first principles in psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 31(2), 179–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354320974103>
- Hu, E. J. (2025). Early confucian ethics encountering social psychology: character, situation, and Xunzi. In *Dialogues with Classical Chinese Philosophy* (pp. 47–70). Routledge.
- Indonesia, H. P. (2010). Kode etik psikologi Indonesia. *Jakarta: HIMPSI*.
- Isaac, R. (2009). Ethics in the practice of clinical psychology. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 6(2), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.20529/ijme.2009.024>
- Jeong, C., & Han, H. (2013). Exploring the relationship between virtue ethics and moral identity. *Ethics & Behavior*, 23(1), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2012.714245>
- Kahane, G. (2013). The armchair and the trolley: an argument for experimental ethics. *Philosophical Studies*, 162(2), 421–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-011-9775-5>
- Kargopoulos, P., V. (2023). What philosophy, if any, is needed for cognitive science? DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals). <https://doi.org/10.4453/rifp.2023.0003>
- Kaulino, A., & Matus, T. (2021). Theoretical proposal for the relationship between epistemology and ethics in psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 31(2), 237–253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211002267>
- King, P., Hodgetts, D., & Guimarães, D. S. (2021). Towards rethinking the primacy of epistemology in psychology: Introduction to the special section. *Theory & Psychology*, 31(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211003161>
- Kirana, Y. (2020). Psikologi dan etika profesi dalam nilai-nilai ilmu pengetahuan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 7(1), 130–149.
- Kordahl, H. L., & Fougner, M. (2017). Facilitating awareness of philosophy of science, ethics and communication through manual skills training in undergraduate education. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2016.1277289>
- Korkut, Y. (2020). Teaching and learning psychology ethics as a meaningful and enjoyable

- experience. *Psychology in Russia State of Art*, 13(1), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.11621/pir.2020.0104>
- Kozlov, A. (2023). Emotions in scientific practice. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 48(2), 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03080188.2023.2193073>
- Laletas, S. (2019). Ethical decision making for professional school counsellors: use of practice-based models in secondary school settings. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 47(3), 283–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2018.1474341>
- Levitt, D. H., & Lishner, D. G. (2016). The ethics of counseling and values: a phenomenological investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(3), 267–278.
- Lucidi, F. (2021). L'etica della ricerca tra scienza, conoscenza, coscienza. *Psicologia clinica dello sviluppo*, 25(2), 303–305. DOI: 10.1449/101511
- Magdha, E. E., & Ediyono, S. (2023). Peran Filsafat dalam Psikologi. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366848338_Peran_Filsafat_dalam_Psikologi
- Mathew, J. L. (2022). Systematic reviews and meta-analysis: a guide for beginners. *Indian Pediatrics*, 59(4), 320–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-022-2500-y>
- Marjo, H. K., & Sodiq, D. (2022). Etika dan kompetensi konselor sebagai profesional (suatu pendekatan literatur sistematis). *Jurnal Paedagogy*, 9(1), 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jp.v9i1.4512>
- Mcdonald-sardi, J., Mathews, R., Reece, J., & Pratt, C. (2020). The effect of experience in psychological practice on making ethical judgements. *Australian Psychologist*, 55(6), 634–644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12463>
- Muhiddin, S. (2014). filsafat ilmu psikologi: kaitannya dengan metode penelitian dan penerapan kode etik psikologi. https://www.academia.edu/download/57283235/Filsafat_Ilmu_Psikologi.pdf
- Ningsih, W. (2021). Etika psikolog dalam pengumpulan dan penyampaian hasil pemeriksaan psikologis (tinjauan aksiologi). *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, 4(1), 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v4i1.31344>
- Oppong, V. B., Osafo, J., & Ofori-Atta, A. (2022). Ethical dilemmas in psychological services in Ghana: the views of clinical psychologists. *Ethics & Behavior*, 32(3), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2021.1895795>
- Pedhu, Y. (2020). Isu-isu etika penggunaan tes psikologi dalam bimbingan konseling. In *Seminar Nasional Daring IIBKIN 2020* (pp. 85–97). <https://conference.um.ac.id/index.php/bk3/article/view/312/282>
- Pettifor, J. L., Sinclair, C., & Strong, T. (2005). The role of dialogue in defining ethical principles: the canadian code of ethics for psychologists. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18(2), 183–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530590914833>
- Phillips, V., & Barker, E. (2021). Systematic reviews: structure, form and content. *Journal of Perioperative Practice*, 31(9), 349–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750458921994693>
- Pittman, E. (2023). Realist synthesis: an innovative approach to literature review for complex management phenomena. In *Review of management literature* (pp. 137–159). <https://doi.org/10.1108/s2754-586520230000002008>

- Pivato, E. (2008). Personality structure and moral development: exploring the interface. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences Annual Review*, 3(9), 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1882/cgp/v03i09/52708>
- Prokofyev, A. V. (2021). Ethics and psychology (the case of shame studies). *Philosophy Journal*, 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.21146/2072-0726-2021-14-4-5-21>
- Rösler, F. (2019). Ethikvoten in der psychologischen Forschung. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz*, 62(6), 729–737. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-019-02949-3>
- S, V. P., Chakraborty, A., & Kar, A. K. (2024). How to undertake an impactful literature review: Understanding review approaches and guidelines for high-impact systematic literature reviews. *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases*, 13(1), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22779779241227654>
- Sahni, S., & Sinha, C. (2016). Systematic literature review on narratives in organizations: research issues and avenues for future research. *Vision the Journal of Business Perspective*, 20(4), 368–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262916678085>
- Sánchez-Chero, M., Sifuentes, F. A. P., Santisteba, L. J. C., & Valverde, K. S. G. (2023). Ethics, science and research: the role of the researcher in the current context. *Encuentros. Revista de Ciencias Humanas, Teoría Social y Pensamiento Crítico.*, (19 (septiembre-diciembre)), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8270801>
- Savulescu, J. (2025). The point of moral philosophy: to direct how we should live and act. In *What Is the Point of Moral Philosophy?* (pp. 153–174). Routledge.
- Savulescu, J., & Giannopoulou, P. (2025). To be human is to be better: a discussion with Julian Savulescu. *Conatus: Journal of Philosophy*, 10(1). 10.12681/cjp.39904
- Schwartz, B. (2022). Practical wisdom: what philosophy and literature can add to Psychology. In Oxford University Press eBooks (pp. 406–416). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190064570.013.27>
- Sihono, H.M., Rahmawan, W.A., Rismanto, L.D., Sariningtyas, E.R.W., & Sugiarti, R. (2024). A systematic literature review: hubungan antara etika dengan psikologi dan etika dengan filsafat dalam praktek profesional. *SOSFILKOM : Jurnal Sosial, Filsafat Dan Komunikasi*, 17(2), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.32534/jsfk.v17i2.5233>
- Singh, S. (2017). How to conduct and interpret systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Clinical and Translational Gastroenterology*, 8(5), e93. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ctg.2017.20>
- Tabares, A. S. G., Ospina, J. F., & Henao, A. F. M. (2019). Hacia una explicación naturalizada del problema filosófico de las otras mentes. *Revista Guillermo De Ockham*, 17(2), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.21500/22563202.4269>
- Theile, C. M., & Beall, A. L. (2024). Narrative reviews of the literature: an overview. *Journal of Dental Hygiene*, 98(1).
- Torcello, L. (2016). The ethics of belief, cognition, and climate change pseudoskepticism: implications for public discourse. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 8(1), 19–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12179>
- Turk, N. (2021). Methodology of systematic reviews. *Slovenian Medical Journal*, 90(7–8), 432–442. <https://doi.org/10.6016/zdravvestn.3138>

- Van Niekerk, A. (2025). Science and ethics: perspectives on value and moral considerations in contemporary practice of science. *Tydskrif Vir Geesteswetenskappe*, 65(3), 841–851. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2224-7912/2025/v65n3a5>
- Van Slyke, J., Peterson, G. R., Spezio, M., Reimer, K., & Brown, W. (2012). *Theology and the science of moral action*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203101742>
- Wahman, J. (2011). Experimenting with ethics in the twenty-first century. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 25(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jspecphil.25.1.0033>
- Walsh, R. T. G. (2015). Introduction to ethics in psychology: historical and philosophical grounding. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 35(2), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000015>
- Widapratama, F. R., & Raharjo, S. T. (2017). Pentingnya memahami peran dan fungsi serta kode etik supervisi pekerja sosial dalam profesi pekerja sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian & PKM*, 4(2), 129–389.
- Wilton, R., & Harley, T. (2017). *Science and Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315529295>
- Wilujeng, S. R. (2013). Filsafat, etika dan ilmu: upaya memahami hakikat ilmu dalam konteks keindonesiaan. *Humanika*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.17.1>.
- Young, G. (2016). A broad ethics model for mental health practice. *Ethics Medicine and Public Health*, 2(2), 220–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2016.03.005>
- Zachorodna, K. (2021). The importance of empirical research in ethics: moral psychology and philosophical ethics. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 77(1), 151. <https://doi.org/10.12775/rf.2021.008>