

## CEBES – Appendix 2

Below, you find explanations for the eight questions that form step 2 of the CEBES procedure (main source: Checkliste für psychologische Forschung der Ethikkommission der Philosophischen Fakultät; translation of the German text that has been largely adopted).

**Question 1:** Often, study participants are students that are to some extent in a relationship of dependence with the principal investigator (PI) or the superiors of the PI (e.g., because they are examined by this person or because they are employed as tutorial assistant). In such a case, one has to take measures such that the participants won't have any negative consequences when participating in the study – e.g. lower grades in case they underperform in the study. A way to deal with this problem is to ensure anonymisation towards the person to which there is a relationship of dependence (e.g., when this persons grades the participants). If anonymisation is ensured in case of such a relationship of dependence, then the answer of this question is NO.

**Question 2:** Examples of persons that are non-judicious include children, person with a mental illness, persons with dementia or persons with psychiatric or severe physical diseases. According to the Human Research Act, the following person groups count as particularly vulnerable: children (minors until the completion of their 14<sup>th</sup> year), adolescents (minor after the completion of their 14<sup>th</sup> year), incapacitated adults, pregnant women, imprisoned persons, and persons involved in emergencies. If such persons are expected to participate in the research, then the answer to question 2 is YES.

**Question 3:** This question concerns studies, in which the behavior of the participants is observed or influenced without their knowledge (e.g., in case of field studies or observational studies in non-public places).

**Question 4:** This question concerns studies in which the participants are deceived in an explicit and targeted way. This means, that the participants are not informed or misinformed on relevant aspects of the study in a way that they can reasonably consider themselves as being deceived. Examples include manipulated feedback on accomplishments made during the experiment, misinformation regarding the goals of the study, interaction during the experiment with someone who is part of the study team but has been presented as a “fellow participant”. This question does not concern the circumstance that participants are usually not fully informed on all details of the study and the hypotheses that the study investigates.

**Question 5:** This question concerns surveying information that is sensitive due to two reasons: First, the information should be treated confidential because disclosing this information could have a negative impact on the person (e.g., information regarding political opinions). Second, disclosing the information by the participant could induce strong emotions in the participant (e.g., traumatic experiences), so that the survey could cause an unacceptable emotional stress.

**Question 6:** Here, one has to check whether the consequences of the intervention are questionable. For example, inducing a mood change through happy or sad music is uncritical, because such music is pervasive and one cannot expect serious consequences. But showing images that display cruelty or mutilation is critical – although such images are present in everyday life as well, but one is not forced to see them and they could cause serious emotional distress.

**Question 7:** Not every study involving group interaction is questionable, but such interactions could put participants into negatively experienced social situations. Examples include competition where

some participants obviously fail, studies that induce aggression or shame. Again, one has to balance between minor discomfort that are experienced in everyday life as well and that are tolerable (e.g., people may get nervous when speaking in a group), and stress that is no more tolerable (e.g., when one yells toward participants).

**Question 8:** This concerns the distinction between usual reimbursement of participants (this may vary across disciplines) and high reimbursement that is deliberately used in the study to reach a study goal (e.g., to induce a particular high motivation to perform well).

**Question 9:** Here, one has to clarify whether the design of the study involves the risk of disclosing sensitive information to unauthorized third persons. For example an interview study on sexual orientation may involve the risk that the interviewed person discloses his/her sexual orientation by waiting at a specific spot for the interview from which it is known that study participants have to wait there.