

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Wednesday, November 18, 2020
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Teams

Minutes of the SREB Meeting

Attendance

Alyssa Bax (non-voting)
 Linda Morrice
 Dipanjan Chatterjee
 Michele Donnelly
 Angela Book
 Nicole Luke
 Jo-Ann Boyle-Jackson

Lori Walker (non-voting)
 Robert Steinbauer
 Miya Narushima
 Christine Tardif-Williams
 Veronica Panchyshyn
 Heather Chalmers

Regrets

Sandra Kroeker
 Sandra Bosacki
 Elizabeth Shulman
 Xiaoyang Xia

| MINUTES | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| ITEM | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
| 1 | <p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve October Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve October Decision Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved | <p>Motion to approve: RS Seconded: MN All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: RS All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: CTW Seconded: MN All in favour</p> |
| 2 | <p>Discussion Items</p> <p>COVID Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office update the board on the authorization of a number of stage 3 files that have come through the SREB for clearance It was outlined that although most stage 3 research that has come through the office with the correct stage 3 authorization process completed have been approved, one of these studies proposed in-person data collection in Toronto (which is a red zone in terms of COVID restrictions). In this case REB clearance is postponed until researchers modify their application to meet the safety restrictions or the restrictions are lifted – in which case they can reapply. Research that is more than minimal risk as a result of COVID-19 - such as the previous example - may be reviewed by the full board in cases where the researcher does not wish to revise their protocol, or it may be put on hold until they can justify why the research is necessary. <p>Deception in Research Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of deception in research often to deliberately deceive/mislead the participants of the true purpose/procedure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g., to allow for natural behaviour | |

- Types of deception were outlined:
 - Omission (passive deception)
 - Active deception – e.g., false info
 - Deceptive procedures – e.g., rigged games
 - Use of confederates
 - Covert procedures/research
- Discussed that honesty is always required for certain aspects of deceptive research such as risk and confidentiality measures. Parental consent (with full disclosure of deceptive portion) is also required for deception research with children.
- Following deceptive research, a debrief with an opportunity to withdraw consent or provide informed consent is required.
- The TCPS states that deception should only be used when other designs are inadequate to answer the research questions. Furthermore, the research must be of minimal risk only, and participant's lack of consent must not adversely impact them.
- Authorized Deception provides participants with a warning that there may be deceptive elements in the research.
- Chapter 3 of the TCPS2 includes articles on deception for more information.

Case Study (Milgram Experiment) Discussion:

- Active deception (told the participants false information)
- Included the use of confederates
- Studied the impact of authority on ethical decision making and obedience
- Mental health/psychological risk of the study discussed
- Q: would this study get through ethics today?
- A: No because there is greater than minimal risk to participants
- Could potentially receive clearance if the risk/deception is disclosed in some way or in simulation environments (VR) where the risk is lower.
- Q: What were the benefits of this study in terms of knowledge for society.
- A1: Highlights the power of authority despite personal beliefs about their decision making. Provides insight into why some individuals do what their superiors tell them to regardless of if they agree (e.g., wars)
- A2: Helps us to understand the mechanisms to prevent this type of behaviour.
- Q: How can the impact of deception be mitigated?
- A1: Through the use of VR and/or authorized deception.
- A2: Through the provision of mental health resources for participants.
- A3: By allowing participants to withdraw their data.
- A4: By having a second consent form with the true purpose etc...
- Q: Does including a second consent form decrease the risk?

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A: The second consent form is the “informed consent” form whereas the first one is just a “consent form”. Informed consent is required for the use of participant data. • Q: Could a study like this be completed effectively without the use of deception? • A: Likely not. Participants don’t know what they are capable of until they are put into the deceptive situation. However, the use of deception challenges informed consent and is often seen as a grey area in research ethics. • Discussed that the design of this experiment is similar to what may happen as a result of many different types of “uniforms” including supervisory roles which are also a form of authority. <p>Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for changes to compensation have been coming in as a result of the switch to online data collection in many labs. • In some cases, researchers are not ensuring that compensation is equitable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paying participants different amounts based on what platform they complete surveys on (e.g., Qualtrics vs. MTurk) even though the task is the same - E.g., Students receive \$10 while community members receive \$20 - Students have to take a research course credit instead of the monetary value (no option to choose) - Draws for some participants, gift-cards for others • Board discussed that the value of participation should not change based on the above factors. Data cannot be selectively valued differently than others. • Q: Why does this happen – how is it justified? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Platforms have suggested values they provide for researchers to use so as to not skew samples of participants. 2. Recruitment is not supposed to be payment but compensation for time, so it is not coercive. 3. Some groups (community members, older adults, families etc) are harder to access and may require more compensation than others. • Overall, the discussion came to the conclusion that researchers should be required to compensate their participants equitably unless they are able to justify why they require there to be a difference. • The GPPC has been tasked with creating a guideline for how to equitably compensate all participants. • Note: Slates for both boards were accepted at the RSP meeting and put forward to be approved at the next senate meeting. | |
| 4 | Adjourn | Meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m. | <p>Motion to adjourn: VP Seconded: NL All in favour</p> |

