

PROTOCOL ETHICS ASSESSMENT RESEARCH
WITHIN THE
FACULTY OF ARTS
AND THE
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
OF THE
RADBOD UNIVERSITY

Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities

Faculty of Arts
Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies
Radboud University

Version 1.4 dated December 2019

CONTENTS

- 1. Aim and procedure of the Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities(EACH)**
- 2. Procedure for filing a project with the EACH**
- 3. Stipulations for research within the FoA and FPhTR**
 - 3.1 Review by the EACH or by the Medical-Institutional Review Board?**
 - 3.2 Research within the FoA and FPhTR**
 - 3.2.1 Behaviour registration
 - 3.2.2 Psychophysiological registration
 - 3.2.3 Interview
 - 3.2.4 Media data registration
 - 3.3 Selecting participants**
 - 3.4 Screening participants**
 - 3.5 Coincidental findings**
 - 3.6 Voluntariness of participants**
 - 3.7 Informed consent**
 - 3.7.1 Specifications regarding the consent form and the information document
 - 3.7.2 Information document
 - 3.7.3 Consent form
 - 3.8 Anonymity**
 - 3.9 Feedback, deception and debriefing**
 - 3.10 Recruiting participants**
 - 3.11 Legal framework**
 - 3.12 Didactic and scientific-ethical framework**

The structure of this document and a considerable number of formulations have been copied from a similar document from and with the permission of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Amsterdam.

1. Aim and procedure of the Ethics Assessment Committee

1.1 The primary aim of the Ethics Assessment Committee (EACH) of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies is to ethically assess the research within the faculties regarding persons, before this research is carried out. It deals both with research that takes place within the faculties' facilities and research that takes place on behalf of the faculties (for example, within a school, company or institution). Research carried out by a guest researcher should first be reviewed by the researcher's own institution before it can be filed with the EACH of the Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies of the Radboud University.

1.2 All research within the faculties that include participation or data of individuals, either explicit or implicit, must be reviewed using criteria as formulated by the faculties; this also applies to research that is carried out in an educational context, as well as research that is carried out using the internet (online experiment programmes). Research that is carried out as part of Bachelor's or (Research) Master's degree programmes should be filed for review by the supervising teacher. Research that is carried out as part of PhD projects should be filed for review by the executive PhD student.

1.3 Analysis of existing data files and of data that does not regard individuals does not fall under the above criterion. Researchers are expected to be aware of this criterion and should use it to determine themselves whether their intended research should be reported to the EACH.

1.4 A researcher with an appointment at or access to the Faculty of Arts or Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies is always primarily responsible for the research. If the research is carried out by a student, trainee or hired employee, an employee of the Faculty of Arts or Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies should bear the responsibility. Researchers who share an appointment with another institute should file their research with the institution that has the responsibility over that research. The researcher filing the research with the EACH is hereafter called the project manager.

1.5 The board strives to differentiate between cases that have to be considered for explicit review and those that are standard research, which can be dealt with via a quick ('abridged') procedure, in order not to frustrate researchers and education with time consuming procedures. On the other hand, wherever researchers propose matters that are new or deviating, it may be expected that they be prepared to account for their proposal and allow for a certain time frame for the review by the board.

1.6 The EACH consists of a chair and several members with such expertise that the different types of research as carried out within the faculty research institutes are covered. These being the Centre for Language Studies (CLS), the Radboud Institute for Culture & History (RICH) and the Research Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies (see 3.2), as well as an expert in the Ethics discipline (from the

department of Philosophy). The Bureau Onderzoek (Research Office) of the Faculty Office of the Faculty of Arts provides the secretariat for the board. The EACH meets on predetermined dates, and if it deems it necessary, also on an ad hoc basis (for the meeting dates, see the website of the EACH). During meetings the policy of the EACH is accentuated and specific research projects that have been filed with the EACH via the application procedure are discussed.

1.7 The EACH has drawn up regulations for the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies with regard to carrying out research, and makes binding decisions regarding the acceptability of research. Starting points are generic criteria for ethically responsible research, as stipulated in the *Declaration of Helsinki*¹ and by the APA². Processing and storage of personal data takes place in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR³) and the Radboud University Privacy Statement⁴. Following social developments or experiences in the research field, regulations can be changed and the acceptability of research can be questioned at any given point. In all cases, the EACH has the last say regarding the acceptability of research and the EACH can also withdraw its permission for research that is already in progress (in exceptional cases, of course). Research that should be discussed during a meeting of the EACH (research to which an abridged procedure does not apply), is dealt with during the first regular meeting or sooner should this be possible and should there be urgent reasons to do so. A decision regarding *approving* or *dismissing* a research project is always provided within two months (unless further information is required and that information is not submitted in time; in which case the decision period will be correspondingly longer).

1.8 The EACH strives to ensure the assessment procedure is as streamlined as possible. Research projects that hardly differ from previously carried out research – in other words, standard research as has been carried out within the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies for years – do not have to be assessed in detail again. Examples are: research projects for which the stimulus material,

¹ *Declaration of Helsinki - Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects*, passed in 1964 by the *World Medical Association* and reviewed in 2008. Central elements are the guarantee that participants (competent or not competent, whether in a dependant relationship to the researcher or not) can always withdraw their participation, without any consequences. For the complete document, please visit <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/17c.pdf>

² *American Psychological Association*; for the most recent, ethical regulations and procedures, please visit <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>

³ <https://autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl/nl/onderwerpen/avg-europese-privacywetgeving/algemene-informatie-avg>

⁴ <https://www.ru.nl/vaste-onderdelen/privacyverklaring-radboud-universiteit/>

type of questionnaire or type of experiment only marginally deviates from research projects previously approved by the EACH.

Therefore, the EACH works with descriptions of standard research, which are supplied by the separate chair groups and/or principal investigators groups. Project managers that indicate in their application that their research falls under the description of such standard research will follow an abridged application procedure. The descriptions of standard research are regularly updated, for example following evaluation or visitation or as soon as the chair or principal investigators deem this necessary.

When the application involves standard research, it is sufficient that the project manager files the research with the EACH by means of filling out the application form and submitting the project proposal, the information document and the consent form that go with the research. The EACH (usually, in practice: the secretary, the chair and the subject-matter expert) checks the details (outside the EACH meeting) and if at least the members listed above give their permission, approval is granted to the research. In the following EACH meeting a list with approved projects is submitted as an agenda item for the purpose of notification.

In all other cases – the research does not fall or not fully fall under the general frameworks and procedures – the research is discussed during the meeting. In these cases, the application should also be filled out and the project proposal, the information document and the consent form that go with the research should be submitted. Apart from these documents, information on the points on which the research deviates from standard research and all information necessary to enable the EACH to come to a decision regarding approval should be submitted. In very exceptional cases, a fast review can be carried out by one or more members of the EACH, in consultation with the other members in writing.

2. Procedure for filing a project with the Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities

2.1 To ensure a good assessment of the research project, it is important to know within which sub-discipline or interdisciplinary group a certain type of research will be carried out. Often, researchers within that discipline have ample experience with that type of research; however, this research should be submitted anyway. Research that has never been carried out within a certain discipline will require extra attention from the EACH.

2.2 Research projects will be filed for assessment as a whole as much as possible. In principle, the project manager responsible is free to determine whether and for which parts of the research a separate application is filed. It is necessary, however, to clearly describe which separate segments the project will consist of, as well as the different methodological approaches that are required for these segments. In principle, permission from the EACH is granted for a period of 5 years. Should the research continue after 5 years, then the project manager should again contact the EACH. Modifications to the research project might warrant review of the ethical approval. This does not concern relatively minor changes, like a bigger sample of subjects or a replication of a research project in a similar way, but involves changes to parts that are relevant to the EACH.

2.3 Generally, research projects that are filed as project proposals with an external grant provider are filed for assessment after selection by the grant provider. If the grant provider requests this, project proposals can also be assessed by the EACH before they are filed. In case of a multi-staged filing procedure (filing of the proposal – selection for elaboration – final filing) the assessment can take place in the elaboration phase prior to the final filing.

2.4 The project manager submits a written description of the research (in Dutch or English), which will be handed out to participants. It should be clear to participants from this **information document** what impact, risk or discomfort the research involves. Other stipulations should also be included in this document (see *informed consent*, 3.7): compensation, voluntariness, screening, anonymity, data storage, etc. The project manager also submits a **consent form** that participants will sign, if they are prepared to participate in the research and after they have read the information document. It is possible that the two documents can be combined. Example forms can be found on the website of the EACH. In instances of laboratory research, the consent form should always be signed beforehand. The transfer of rights can also be arranged in the consent form. If the research requires that deceptive information be provided to participants, additional stipulations apply; for instance, in the case of audio or visual recordings being made and participants only being informed of this afterwards, because knowing this may influence the behaviour. In such a case, the project manager also submits the text for the debriefing. Should it not be possible to meet the above requirement out of interest for the research, the researcher submits a separate document in which it is stated:

- in which way impact on participants can be caused
- to which extent and in which way implicit or explicit permission from participants is obtained
- via which procedure it is guaranteed that the research does not cross any ethical boundaries. This procedure can cover giving feedback to the EACH during the research.

NB: a research in which such a document is included can never be dealt with in an abridged procedure (as mentioned in 2.5 and further).

2.5 The project manager fills out the **application form** and files this, together with the project proposal, the information document, the consent form and other relevant documents. On the basis of this information the secretary advises whether the EACH can deal with the research via an *abridged procedure*, including the official secretary and two members of the EACH dealing with the application, or whether it should be dealt with via the *longer procedure*, including the application being dealt with during a meeting. It is also possible that the research falls outside the jurisdiction of the EACH of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies, mainly because the research falls under the *Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act*. In this last case, the research should be reviewed by a recognised Medical Institutional Review Board, for example that of our sister faculty, the Faculty of Medicine / UMC St. Radboud (see for more information section 3.1). As soon as the application form and the relevant information have been filed, the project manager receives a confirmation of receipt per email.

2.6 If the abridged procedure can be used, the secretary of the EACH will forward the application to two EACH members, after which the project manager will receive a notice. The research can only start after approval has been granted. The EACH may also ask for additional information. In that case, the research may not start. It is also possible that the EACH comes to the conclusion through the abridged procedure (for example, because it encounters non-standard aspects or has doubts) that the research should be assessed using the longer procedure and should be discussed in a meeting. In that case, the secretary will notify the project manager of this and the project manager is asked to continue as described under 2.7.

2.7 If the abridged procedure cannot be used, the project manager is informed of this by the secretary of the EACH. Then, the secretary will forward the proposal as a whole to the EACH for the longer procedure and it will be placed on the agenda for the next scheduled EACH meeting (or, should the EACH deem it necessary, for an ad hoc meeting about this proposal). Only after the EACH has assessed this research, can approval be granted after which the research can start. Should approval not be granted, reasons will be provided and suggestions will be made to alter the research plan. It is also possible that the EACH decides that it is not competent to judge the research, mainly because it is of the opinion that the research falls under the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act and should therefore be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board.

3. Stipulations for research within the FoA and FPhTR

3.1 Review by the EACH or by the Medical-Institutional Review Board?

Rarely does research within the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies have a clinical character. Still, it should first be established whether the research should be reviewed by a recognised Medical Institutional Review Board (MIRB). In that case, the EACH of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies is not authorised to grant its approval to the research, but the research should be filed with a recognised MIRB for review (for example, that of the UMC St. Radboud, or that of a different institution involved in the research). The criteria used to establish whether research should be reviewed by the EACH or by the MIRB are listed below. The relevant regulations and stipulations with this regard can be found in the Dutch WMO (Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act). Moreover, there is the Centrale Commissie Mensgebonden Onderzoek, CCMO (Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects). It is stipulated legally that research falls under the WMO if both of the following criteria are met:

1. The research is medical-scientific research.
2. The participants undergo actions and/or the participants are compelled to behave in a certain way.⁵

Statement 1 is answered 'yes' if a health care institution is involved in the research in one of the following ways:

- one or more employees of a health care institution is/are involved in the research as participants or in carrying out or execution of the research, or
- the research takes place within the walls of the institution and should, following the nature of the research, generally not be carried out outside the institution, or
- patients / clients of the institution participate in the research (in the form of treatment).

If statement 1 is **not** answered 'yes', but statement 2 **is**, then this research should be assessed by the Ethics Assessment Committee. This is usually the case with research within the Faculty of Arts and in some cases in research within the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies.

More specifically, research falls under the scope of the EACH if one of the following criteria is met:

- individuals undergo actions
- individuals are compelled to behave in a certain way
- personal details from individuals are collected and saved

In case of linguistic research of language functions, such as speech and language understanding and speech and language production, sometimes it is examined how

⁵ WMO Art. 1, section 1 sub b.

these processes can be monitored in the brain. In this case, so-called psychophysiological methods are used as also used in medical research, such as an EEG or MRI. However - if they are applied according to that which is stated under 3.1.2, a negligible risk is involved. Minor variations to this type of research should however be reviewed most carefully, because they might have ethically relevant consequences. Scientific research into communication, information and literature examines the effects of textual and communicative products to individuals; usually repercussions to the wellbeing of the individual are not to be expected. Historical, practical philosophical and practical theological research sometimes uses informants as sources; here too generally repercussions to the wellbeing of the individual are not to be expected. Theology and religious studies may expose patterns which give meaning to life by means of interviews and observations; this can have an impact on the participants. Thus, all these disciplines fall outside the medical-scientific field in their research, but individuals are involved in this research and/or data of individuals is saved; therefore, they are reviewed ethically.

3.2 Research within the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies

Criterion for reviewing research within the faculties is:

Is there question of research in which individuals are involved who undergo actions, who are compelled to behave in a certain way, and/or of whom personal details are collected and saved?

Based on the method of measuring, we distinguish four main types of research for which this criterion applies:

3.2.1. Behaviour registration

These are experiments in which the participant performs a task for which stimuli are given in one or more sensory forms. The participant is placed in a setting consisting of stimulus equipment and means to measure behaviour. The test will not take longer than four hours (under 18 years old: no longer than two hours, under 6 years old: no longer than one hour, under 2 years old: no longer than 30 minutes). The participant does not have to maintain the same pose for more than 60 minutes. The participant does not participate in the research more than three times a week. The stimulus material and/or the behaviour registration can cause some impact on the participant, which can cause some discomfort, but this may never cause any damage.

3.2.2 Psychophysiological registration

These are measurements during which bodily functions are registered under influence of stimuli offered in one or more forms. The procedure takes place according to generally accepted standards for working hygienically in a laboratory setting. The participant is not placed in the same setting for over two hours and does not have to sit or lie in the same pose for more than 60 minutes, the continuous period in which the participant is not allowed to move must be no longer than 20 minutes. The physical discomfort is minimised. The participant is not placed under a scanner more than three times a day (children under the age of 12: no more than two times a day), and does not participate in this type of registration more than two times a week.

3.2.3 Interview

This includes methods in which the participant involved in the research transfers his/her opinions, reactions, memories or evaluations to the researcher by means of an oral conversation or a written questionnaire, with the researcher interpreting these qualitatively or quantitatively and using them in a publication. It also includes research methods revealing and spreading personal details from deceased individuals by means of source research, which can have ethical consequences with regard to the next of kin. In all cases, discomfort can be caused as the result of publicising personal details that can be traced to the individual.

If the project manager is of the opinion that supplying an information form, having a consent form signed and (if applicable) supplying a debriefing form is not possible in the research filed, he/she should give arguments for this impossibility and state in which way the researcher guarantees that the integrity and anonymity of the participants will be respected with regard to collecting, saving and scientifically using data (see also the last paragraph of stipulation 2.4).

3.2.4 Media data registration

Considering the discomfort for individuals or protecting the privacy of individuals is less of a focus when researching internet data, because information from these online data that can be traced to the author are already generally available by or on behalf of this individual on the internet. However, publicising data through research could cause extra discomfort. Researchers should make responsible considerations in this matter. In collection and saving data from the internet that are used for research mainly the author's right and the embedded copyright are of importance.

Below stipulations are elaborated on that apply to all methods of measuring. Should a document be drawn up as described in paragraph 2.4, then paragraphs 3.3, 3.7 (including subparagraphs) and 3.9 do not apply).

3.3 Selecting participants

A standard participant is a healthy adult (16 years or over) and competent volunteer, who participates in a research study and receives a non-disproportionate compensation, and who is not dependent whatsoever on the researcher or the person carrying out the research. Research cannot take place with individuals who are in an inferior position to the researcher outside the research (for example, children or students with whom the researcher has a direct didactic relation).

Apart from adult, competent participants, minor participants can also be used in research. If babies or children are to participate in research, permission from the parent or guardian must be voluntarily provided. Seeing as such research can never meet the criterion of competence, it should always be filed for review with the EAC; an important criterion here is whether the research in question cannot be conducted with adults instead of children.

It is possible that the researcher contacts an institutional environment (college, health care institution, company, etc.) to participate in the research, in which the manager of that environment in his turn contacts the occupants / members / students to participate. Again, these participants should be adult individuals who will sign the consent form (see under 3.7) individually, though possibly all using the same form.

Regarding participation of non-adults or incompetent participants, see 3.7. A collective insurance is taken out for individuals participating in research by the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies, to cover risk of accident during the stay in the laboratory and while travelling to and from the laboratory. Within the frame of the policy terms and conditions, the liability insurance of the Radboud University covers research (non-invasive), provided that the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act does not include specific stipulations with regard to insuring participants. This coverage includes both damage to equipment as well as damage to/of the participants and the researchers. This coverage applies to researchers of the Radboud University and guest researchers within the Radboud University. Apart from that, this insurance applies to external (possibly commercial) research, as long as this research is carried out by employees of the Radboud University. Should the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act include specific stipulations, the researcher responsible should file an application for participants insurance in a timely fashion. A research proposal should be included in this application (WMO application).

3.4 Screening of participants

If required for the research, participants are screened on characteristics relevant for the research. Examples are hearing tests in case of researching speech perception, or questionnaires regarding neurological or psychological characteristics in case of an EEG, or claustrophobia in case of an FMRI. In the case of FMRI research, special screening procedures always apply in order to keep the risks of these experiments negligible. Furthermore, certain inclusion / exclusion criteria can be used, for example a certain age range or a certain range of language competence scores, whether or not matching those of other participants.

3.5 Coincidental findings

Some methods of research measuring bodily functions can provide accidental findings that can be of importance for the participant. An example is deflection on an FMRI. For this research method, a stipulation should be included in the consent form informing participants of the procedure that should be followed in such a case.

3.6 Voluntariness of participant

No matter which selection method is used, every participant has the right to withdraw from or break-off the research at any moment and for whatever reason, without this having any harmful consequences for the participant or the study results. Also, the participant may decide that his/her data cannot be included in the research after conclusion of the research, but within 24 hours or longer if this has explicitly been agreed on in the consent form. Compensations 'earned' up until that point will be paid pro rata of the length of participation. Individuals who were contacted individually or as a group may not be pressured (including peer pressure) to participate, nor may a compensation higher than that stipulated beforehand be offered.

3.7 Informed consent

Before participating in any research, every participant signs a consent form. This means that the participant consents to the execution of the research and that this consent is given on the basis of correct and full information (informed) with regard to the expected

procedures, discomfort, risk, length, aim, etc. If participants are not capable of giving informed consent (children, people with an intellectual disability), the consent form is submitted to the authorised representative of the participant. Such research never qualifies for the abridged procedure and should always be dealt with by the EACH.

For children and participants under 16 years of age, the following rules apply:

- a) Children under 12 years of age: the parent or guardian gives consent for participation in the research.
- b) Participants from 12 to 16 years of age: both the participant and the parent or guardian give consent for participation in the research.
- c) Participants from 16 years of age: participant gives consent for participation in the research.

Researchers should always be able to demonstrate that a participant gave active consent for participation in the research. If the research takes place within a school, the participant and/or the parent/guardian must be asked for consent. A passive informed consent procedure is not allowed in this case. A passive informed consent procedure might only be allowed if the researcher can demonstrate that the participants are not able to give active consent.

3.7.1 Specifications regarding the consent form and the information document

Prior to the start of the research and while recruiting of participants, the researcher informs the participants about what they can expect during the research. On the basis of this information, the participants are explicitly asked for permission to use the data obtained from him/her for research. After having read the *information document* accompanying the research and prior to participating in the research, the participant signs a *consent form*. The information document and the consent form can be two separate documents or can be combined in one document. For standard examples of information documents and consent forms, please visit the website of the EACH. Both the information document and the consent form should be written in such a way that they are understandable to the target group, even if this target group cannot read. Jargon or unusual abbreviations should always be avoided. The consent form is preferably signed beforehand; this is obligatory for laboratory research. If needed due to the nature of the research, the consent form can be signed afterwards, but then the necessary information should be given orally prior to the research (see 3.6).

3.7.2 Information document

Examples of information documents can be found on the website of the EACH.

The information document should at least include:

- a) the name, the address, telephone number and email address of the project manager, who the participant can contact with further questions.
- b) the name and email address of the secretary of the EACH, who the participant can contact with complaints.
- c) the research procedure and actions that will be taken. On the basis of this information the participant should be allowed to carefully consider the expected discomfort and the length and possible risks (even if they are negligible) of the research.
- d) all factors that may influence the readiness to participate, such as risks, discomfort or harmful effects.
- e) the compensation for participating in the research, and the terms and conditions for payment of this compensation. If professional services (such as treatment or education) are offered as compensation for participating in the research, the researcher should clearly state the nature of the services, as well as the risks, obligations and limitations that these services entail.
- f) which categories of individuals are advised not to participate in the research, because of an increased risk or discomfort for these individuals. Examples are: individuals with claustrophobia for fMRI experiments, people with the inclination to faint for emotional stress experiments, pregnant women for research that involves substances such as alcohol (this is independent from the screening necessary for some research categories, see *Screening participants for psychophysiological registration*).
- g) the aim of the research. If the aim of the research cannot be made public prior to the research because of the hypothesis, then an explanation will always be given in a debriefing as quickly as possible after the research has ended. In this debriefing any possible harmful effects of the deception are explored. The researcher can never mislead the participant with regard to important aspects of the research that may influence the willingness to participate in the research, such as risks, discomfort or harmful effects.
- h) a notification regarding the extent to which the anonymity of the participant is guaranteed in case of participating in the research, information on data storage and the ways in which data will be accessible to third parties. Permission for making the data available to public data collections should be given directly on the consent form. Anonymity should be guaranteed in such a case. In case of audio or video recordings or text registration for linguistic corpora it is explicitly stated that anonymity cannot be guaranteed, but it also explicitly stated who the possible users will be and what the possible user aims of the material are. Such material can never be made public without prior explicit permission of the participants.
- i) a notification that participating is always voluntary and that the participants can refuse to participate in the research without giving reasons for this and can break off their participation at any point, as well as refusing to have their data used for the research after conclusion of the research. None of this will have harmful consequences for the participants or the study results. Compensations 'earned' up until that point will be paid anyway (pro rata of the length of participation).
- j) if there is a chance of coincidental findings (see 3.5), the procedure that is used should be explained. *The participant should explicitly agree with this procedure, by means of a separate signature on the informed consent form.* Examples of information documents can be found on the website of the EACH.
- k) name and contact details of Radboud University's data protection officer.

3.7.3 Consent form

Examples of consent forms can be found on the website of the EACH.

The consent form, which must be signed by the researcher and participant, states that the participant has taken notice of the contents of the information document and understands it fully (if the information document is a separate from the form to be signed, a clear referral to this information document is included in the form). If there are any additional stipulations (screening, coincidental findings, *debriefing*) the participant also signs for these procedures separately, and fills out the information necessary. All contact addresses as stated in the information document (see above, under a and b) are also included in the form. If he/she wishes, the participant is given a copy of the form and a copy of the information document to take home.

An exception to the *informed consent procedure* as stated above can be made in the following cases:

a) research in which a questionnaire or experiment is offered without the project manager and the participant meeting, for example when a questionnaire is sent by post and filled out at home, or when a questionnaire or experiment is offered via a website. In such a case, the researcher provides the information as mentioned above in an enclosed letter or on the website, and the participant should give active consent for participating in the study. Again, the participant is free to decide to stop filling out the questionnaire at any point.

b) if the participant cannot read or write, a similar oral permission should be obtained, in the presence of a witness⁶ and such statements should be recorded on video. Such research is always discussed separately by the EACH and can never be dealt with in an abridged procedure.

3.8 Anonymity

Details obtained via the research are never distributed to third parties (including publications, but also for use in presentations or in mutual consultations) in such a way that the results or other findings can be traced back to a certain participant. Cases in which results from previous research are brought forward as selection criterion for participants form an exception to this stipulation. In that case, the information is encrypted as much as possible and is not offered to persons who are not involved in carrying out the research. Naturally, in such a case the information is anonymised after the data collection and publication which is always anonymous as well.

In some cases it might be useful to use the results of certain participants for educational purposes (educations, conventional presentations, scientific documentaries, etc.). It can also be the explicit aim to collect and file data that can be traced back to the individual, such as is the case in creating linguistic and media corpora. If there is a danger that the anonymity of the participant is harmed, as is the case for photos, videos or sound recordings but possibly also for psychophysiological registrations, then explicit permission should be obtained before or after the research. Using such data is only allowed for purposes that the participant (or his/her legal representative) has given the

⁶ Dutch WMO art. 6, section 2.

researcher *separate* permission for, whenever possible in writing, but if the participant cannot read or write, this can be done orally as well. All data in which participants are identifiable are kept according to the applicable legislation and regulations with regard to privacy; see also the related topic 'legal frameworks' (3.11).

3.9 Feedback, deception and *debriefing*

It is recommended to give participants feedback after the research has ended regarding the aim and set-up of the research they have participated in. If deception was used in the research, giving a debriefing is obligatory. Deceiving participants is only allowed if it is required for the research that participants do not have a clear image of the exact aim or procedure of the experiment. Deception means: providing the participant with inaccurate or incomplete information, or unnoticed registration.

Generally, the following applies to deception:

- a) deception is not allowed with regard to information about the possible risks that are connected to participation. Deception is only allowed if it is not possible to answer the hypothesis without deception.
- b) after deception, generally a full debriefing takes place with the participant regarding the way the participant was deceived. If temporary negative effects of deceit can be expected, then this *debriefing* will take place immediately after conclusion of the experiment (for example, if incorrect negative feedback is given regarding scores). The *debriefing* is formulated in such a way that it may reasonably be expected that the temporary negative effects on, for example, self-image and mood will be removed by the *debriefing*. If temporary negative effects are not expected, the *debriefing* can also take place at a later point; however, no later than two weeks after conclusion of the experiment or partial experiment – this means that longitudinal research in which deception takes place over a longer period should always be filed with the EACH, because generally the *debriefing* should take place as quickly as possible after the deception.

3.10 Recruiting participants

It is not necessary to provide all the information included in the information document while recruiting participants. However, it is necessary that the following is clear:

- a) whether the procedures may be experienced as being strongly negative and entailing considerable discomfort, physical or otherwise, of which it can be expected beforehand to discourage a considerable number of participants from participating.
- b) whether material will be used that is hurtful or unsuitable for certain groups of individuals, for instance because of their religion. Examples can be racist or explicitly sexual photographs or videos or alcohol usage. A different reason to exclude people from participating is if they have previously participated in similar experiments.

3.11 Legal framework

The EACH reviews research filed on the basis of ethical standards. In situations when the stipulations of the EACH do not provide a decision criterion, the applying legislation and regulations are taken as the basis.

In case of audio or video recordings and recording text productions the author's right and/or portrait right may apply. In such a case, the participant should, dependent on the researcher's purpose, give permission in the consent form for the usage and/or filing of the recordings for (1) research and/or (2) public presentation such as during conventions, and/or (3) publication on the secured website of magazines, and/or (4) publication on the internet. This form can be easily combined with the one mentioned under 3.8 (Anonymity).

When using information from the internet for research, both the author's right and the copyright may be important. If the ownership of the data lies with their author (as is the case with emails and websites), written permission from the author should be asked before the data can be used or before parts thereof can be copied. If the copyright lies with the internet company that has made the data available online (social media such as Facebook or Twitter), written permission from this company is formally needed before the data can be used or before parts thereof can be copied. Because these companies usually do not give such permission, it is only possible to allow inspection of such data in scientific publications and presentations by means of referring to where the data can be found on the internet.

3.12 Didactic and scientific-ethical framework

In the assessment of research filed with the EACH, the didactic and scientific standards of the institutions and the research institutions form the starting point. The EACH starts from the viewpoint that the research institute responsible expects the research filed will provide new and important insights and/or didactic learning points for students.

Furthermore, the EACH expects that the research takes place under the supervision of an expert, that the person carrying out the research is well-instructed and capable, and finally that all those involved in the research are aware of and act according to the institutional regulations of scientific research ethics.