

Griffith University Research Ethics Manual

Respect for persons

V3.04 August 2020

Contents

1.0 Introduction
2.0 National guidelines
3.0 Pre-eminence ahead of research objectives
4.0 Respecting the right for self-determination
5.0 Respecting the privacy of individuals
6.0 Human dignity
7.0 Vulnerable persons
8.0 Paternalism
9.0 Respecting beliefs, traditions and cultural protocols
10.0 Cultural limitations
11.0 Human Rights Act 2019

1.0 Introduction

Respect for persons is one of the core ethical principles articulated by the Australian ethical standards (see 2.0) and underpins Griffith University's approach to human research ethics.

There are a number of component elements of how the design, conduct and reporting of research can demonstrate adherence to the ethical principle of respect. These include:

- placing **respect for participants' rights, welfare, dignity and culture** ahead of the objectives of the research;
- respecting the right of individuals to **self-determination**;
- respecting the right of individuals to **privacy**; and
- ensuring the research is **respectful to culture** of potential participants.

Commentary Inset 1 – Identifying people who should be regarded as being 'involved' in a research project

When considering to whom a researcher should show respect, Griffith University researchers are urged to take a broad/inclusive approach. The persons who are considered to be involved in the research should include:

Potential participants – Respect should be shown to persons who are approached about participating in research, which might possibly include:

Privacy (such as the manner in which their contact information is accessed and used);

Dignity (such as what they will be told if they are willing to participate but are screened from the participant pool); and

Risks (such as the measures to ensure third parties are unaware that they have been approached about participating).

Participants – Respect should be shown to current and former participants, which might possibly include:

Giving precedence to respect for their welfare, rights and culture ahead of the objectives of the research project;

Conducting the research consistent with the consent obtained from participants;

Honouring any undertakings made to them with regards to their privacy;

CONTINUED OVERLEAF

This booklet provides practical advice to researchers with regards to planning and conducting research that adheres to the ethical principle of respect.

[Back to contents](#)

2.0 National guidelines

The **National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007, updated 2018)** is the Australian reference for human research ethics matters.

The ethical principle of respect is introduced in **Section 1 of the National Statement**. Throughout the **National Statement** respect for persons is further discussed with regards to specific areas of research and specific participant groups.

[Back to contents](#)

3.0 Pre-eminence ahead of research objectives

The ethical principle of respect for persons requires that we give due regard to the welfare, beliefs, perceptions, customs and cultural heritage, both individual and collective, of those involved in our research.

Respect for persons is based upon the conviction that each human being has intrinsic value in himself/herself, and that this value must inform all our interactions with those people who are involved in our research.

A commitment to these concepts means that our respect for persons must be given pre-eminence ahead of our research objectives. Put another way, our desire to successfully complete a research project can never justify us not respecting those involved in our research (see **Commentary Inset 1** for more about the interpretation of 'those involved in our research').

Commentary Inset 1 – Identifying people who should be regarded as being 'involved' in a research project

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS

Minimising risks to participants and ensuring that the benefits of the research justify the risks;

Considering the degree to which the benefits of the work flow to participants, the community of the participants, or other people like the participants;

If participants were told they would be provided some sort of feedback or debriefing on their individual results, providing those results in an appropriate and timely manner; and

Providing back to participants an appropriate and timely report on the overall results of the research.

Gatekeeper/site – Respect should be shown for any gatekeeper that has approved the research or site with governance responsibility for the participants/research by:

Abiding by any agreements reached with regards to the design, conduct and reporting of the results of the research.

Research team – Researchers show respect for other members of the research team by:

Reaching an agreement with regards to matters such as – who will have access to the research data, who will be collaborating in any immediate or future research outputs, and the order of authorship for those outputs.

Sometimes a more difficult issue to consider is respect to identifiable third parties.

In some situations, it is desirable that such wider respect is afforded.

EXAMPLE – Researchers undertaking a project exploring the work of a community group probably should treat the wider membership of the group with respect, even though the executive of the group are the only people who will be interviewed.

*There are situations where the researchers might not afford such wider respect. Though in nearly all cases these third parties should not be identified in the research publication or other output. Ideally this would have been identified in the original application for research ethics review. Otherwise, researchers must consult with their local Research Ethics Advisor (see **Contacts**) – who may liaise with the Research Ethics Office. The researchers must obtain prior ethics clearance before intentionally not affording a party respect, **especially if that party is to be identifiable in a research output.***

[Back to contents](#)

4.0 Respecting the right for self-determination

Section 1.12 of the National Statement states: Respect for human beings involves giving due scope, throughout the research process, to the capacity of human beings to make their own decisions.

In practice this refers to the requirement that researchers must obtain voluntary consent of participants for their involvement in a project. The University's approach to consent is discussed in [Booklet 22 of the Griffith University-REM](#). In specific circumstances the consent requirement can be waived (e.g. the research use of identified personal information without prior consent). The waiver process is discussed in [Booklet 23 of the Griffith University-REM](#). Some research projects can involve limited disclosure to, or even the intentional deception of, (potential) participants. The requirements for such projects can be found in [Booklet 33 of the Griffith University-REM](#).

Section 1.13 of the National Statement goes on to say:

Where participants are unable to make their own decisions or have diminished capacity to do so, respect for them involves empowering them where possible and providing for their protection as necessary.

When research involves the participation of individuals who have some form of mental or intellectual impairment that might impair their capacity to make an informed decision about their participation the researcher(s) should:

- i. consider whether, given the specifics of a project, the complexity of the issues, and the seriousness of the risks, the individuals can in fact make an informed and discerning decision about their participation;
- ii. consider whether there are any strategies that can be utilised to support or scaffold individuals so they can make an informed and discerning decision; and
- iii. in situations where an individual cannot make an informed and discerning decision, still respect the express wishes of individuals.

Refer to [Booklet 28 of this Manual](#) for more about research involving persons with a mental or intellectual impairment.

Human research in many disciplines can involve the participation of children or young people – especially when you consider some first year university students are aged under 18. Even though in some cases parent/guardian consent (in some form) will be required, there can

Commentary Inset 2 – Mandatory participation in the research

Below is one example of mandatory participation in research and suggested approaches with regards to the ethical issues:

Research for or with a company – In some cases a Griffith University researcher may be commissioned to conduct some research for a company or a company may be very interested in the report or other output from a project being conducted by a Griffith University researcher.

In such circumstances a business may direct its employees to participate in the research activities.

For a Griffith University research project, such mandated participation should be limited to research with no more than a low risk of harm.*

It should be clearly explained to potential participants who is conducting the research, whether the research has been commissioned/funded/welcome (rather than simply approved for conduct), whether the employer/supervisor will know/be made aware of who participated, the nature of the reporting back to the employer, and whether individuals will be identifiable in any reporting of the results (if only by inference).

The consent material should clearly distinguish between the organisational (and so mandatory) activities and the academic research objectives. Typically, the latter will be the use of the collected data for the production of a journal article or other research output. The consent mechanism then would be only for the academic research use of the collected data, not the collection itself.

** An activity is considered, at least to some degree, to be under the auspices of the University where one or more of the below applies:*

- i) the researcher 'owns' the data, can take it back to the University with her/him, and/or use the data for other purposes (e.g. further analysis and publication);*
- ii) the activity will be claimed for internal or external research activity metrics;*
- iii) the work is indemnified by the University.*

be strong (or indeed compelling) reasons to treat the young person as able to consent in their own right. Even if the young person is unable to formally consent to their participation in a project in most cases their wishes should be respected. Refer to [Booklet 24 of this Manual](#) for more about research involving children and young people.

It should be acknowledged that in some contexts (e.g. workplace-based research, or school-based research) participation in some activities may be obligatory. This is often the case when a researcher is engaged to conduct some sort of evaluation or quality improvement activity. In such circumstances the employer, school, authority, etc. may consider the research to be “part of ordinary or otherwise required” activity for that body. Ideally if such a situation exists:

- i) there should be minimal risks to the participants;
- ii) it should be clear who is conducting the work, for what purpose and what will be done/reported about identifiable individuals;
- iii) it should be possible to delineate between the outputs for the body and the academic research outputs; and
- iv) the researchers should treat participants with respect.

Clearly this kind of situation can impact upon the degree to which participation can be considered voluntary and it may introduce risk factors that might otherwise not be present in academic research. An example of a project with mandatory participation, as well as a suggested approach are discussed in [Commentary Inset 2](#). Refer to [Booklet 21 of this Manual](#) for more about ethically justifiable recruitment strategies.

[Back to contents](#)

5.0 Respecting the privacy of individuals

[Section 1.11 of the National Statement](#) states: Researchers and their institutions should respect the privacy, confidentiality and cultural sensitivities of the participants and, where relevant, of their communities. Any specific agreements made with the participants or the community should be fulfilled.

In addition to the ethical dimensions of privacy there are also regulatory frameworks of which a researcher should be aware (e.g. collecting sensitive identified personal information and disclosing that information to third parties without consent may constitute a breach of the Commonwealth privacy law).

Below is a general introduction to how researchers should respect the privacy of individuals. Refer to [Booklet 23 of the Griffith University-REM](#) for more about ethical and regulatory privacy considerations in human research.

It is important to remember that some projects will involve the participation of ‘public figures’, information that is already in the public domain, or matters that should be characterised as organisational/corporate/institutional, rather than private. In such instances, a lower standard of protection is likely to apply. However, the researchers should still honour any specific agreements with participants.

5.1 Recruitment

The recruitment of participants can sometimes raise privacy considerations, for example when the researchers (to identify possible participants) will access lists of clients, customers, etc. that are not publically available. For some research topics, individuals may feel their privacy has been violated if he/she is approached by an unfamiliar researcher about participating in a research project.

The ethical principle of respect for persons requires researchers be mindful of the privacy expectations of potential participants and (especially in the case of extremely sensitive matters) make every effort to assure potential participants that their privacy has not been compromised. [See Booklet 22 of this manual](#) for more about recruitment.

5.2 Responsible management of data

When a project involves greater than a negligible risk and the data collected is potentially identifiable, one measure of respect to participants is the responsible management of data. This responsibility is especially acute when the identifiable data relates to sensitive matters (such as illegal conduct, information that might have negative impact on an individual's employment, sexuality, the fact that a person is living with a serious medical condition, etc.).

Commentary Inset 3 – Mandatory participation in the research

The national guidelines and integrity principles that apply to the retention of research data can be found in the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(2018\)](#). The University has implemented, and clarified our implementation of, the [Australian Code](#) with the release of the Griffith University [Framework for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#).

As per the [Australian Code](#), Griffith University has established policies with regards to the retention of research data and materials. This includes the [Schedule of Retention Periods for Research Data and Primary Materials](#). These arrangements have been registered as part of the University's disposal schedule and so have legislative force.

The University policies on privacy are discussed in [Booklet 23 of the Griffith University Research Ethics Manual](#).

The responsible management of the kind of identifiable data described above is likely to involve all or some of the below:

- i) Is it necessary for the researchers to keep the data in an identified form? Can it be coded during the conduct of the research? At some point can the identifiers be stripped from the data?
- ii) During the conduct of the research how will the data be transported/communicated? How secure are the arrangements? If the data is coded, will the code key be stored/communicated separately?
- iii) How will access to the data be controlled? Is it necessary/prudent to maintain a log of access to and use of the data?
- iv) Will the data be stored for the requisite minimum period (see [Commentary Inset 3](#))? How will the data be destroyed? Will there be any reuse of the data ([see 5.5](#))?

5.3 Disclosure to third parties

Even in circumstances where the data is not considered especially sensitive/contentious, the researchers should make it clear to participants (and sometimes potential participants) what data will be shared with third parties and why (e.g. for transcription purposes).

If there is a possibility that some information may have to be provided to the authorities (e.g. a nursing researcher may have a professional obligation to report observed unsafe behaviour by a registered nurse), the researchers should carefully consider how this is discussed in both the application for research ethics review and in the consent materials. Refer to [Booklet 40 of the Griffith University-REM](#) for more advice on this matter.

5.4 Reporting/research outputs

Even in circumstances where the data is not considered especially sensitive/contentious, the researchers should make it clear to participants (and sometimes potential participants) how the results will be reported/published or otherwise featured in research outputs.

This discussion should explain the degree to which individuals might be identifiable (if only by inference by their immediate colleagues and peers) and whether information will be presented in aggregate, case study or other format.

Of course for some participant populations and research topics, participants will fully appreciate that they will be identifiable, indeed in some cases individuals might only agree to participate if their contribution to the research is attributed to them/acknowledged (e.g. an accomplished artist speaking about the importance of a particular influence on her/his work).

5.5 Reuse of data

There can be a range of compelling reasons to reuse data collected for one research project for another purpose (e.g. the reanalysis of data for a new project, the use of case studies for educational purposes, the inclusion of excerpt audio-visual recordings in a conference presentation).

To be respectful to participants the following matters should be considered (see [Commentary Inset 4](#)):

- i) Will the data be reused in an identified form or, if coded, will the code key be accessed by the person conducting the new use;
- ii) Did the consent for the initial use anticipate reuse;
- iii) Did the consent for the initial use explicitly exclude reuse; and
- iv) Will fresh consent be sought for each reuse?

Commentary Inset 4 – Mandatory participation in the research

The question of whether all, some or none of the [listed arrangements in 5.5](#) need to be in place should be directly based on one ethical reflection and one practical review consideration:

Ethical reflection: A useful way to approach the question about what arrangements need to be in place is to consider it in terms of a sliding scale.

At the high end of the scale is identified personal information, that is sensitive, not already on the public record, probably has some associated risks and individuals are likely to have some concern about the information being shared with other people. In such a case all or most of the arrangements listed at [5.5](#) should be utilised.

At the other end of the scale is genuinely de-identified data, that is reasonably innocuous, and individuals are unlikely to be concerned about it being shared. In such a case only some, or perhaps none of the arrangements listed at [5.5](#) may be necessary.

Between those two ends of the scale only some of the arrangements discussed at [5.5](#) will be necessary.

In practice, if the data is reused in such a way that it is de-identified, and especially when the reuse can appropriately be considered negligible risk, no further consideration of the listed arrangements may be necessary.*

** Including where the data is coded, but the person undertaking the reuse will not have access to the code key.*

A further practical consideration is how much information is provided to the research ethics reviewers about the future reuse or about the specific new use in the original research ethics review, a variation request, or if a reuse project itself is submitted for research ethics review.

Finally, it should be noted that, if potential participants are provided with little information about the reuse of their data they might fear the worst and so elect not to participate in the original research project. It is for this reason researchers are encouraged to say something in the consent material about the reuse of data – if only to state that there will be no reuse of individual's data. It may however be prudent to indicate that de-identified data from the original project may be used for other research purposes.

The ethical considerations with regards to the reuse of data are discussed in [Booklet 42 of the Griffith University-REM](#).

5.6 Other parties

In accordance with [section 1.11 of the National Statement](#), much of the commentary above refers to participants, however researchers should also consider these matters with regards to:

- potential participants;
- other members of the research team; and
- identifiable third parties.

The need for this reflection is more acute when a research project involves more than negligible risk and/or when the research involves highly sensitive matters.

5.7 Justifying not respecting the privacy of individuals

There can be circumstances, albeit relatively rare, where a researcher intends not to respect the privacy of an individual/group (e.g. an industrial relations researcher exposing the unethical conduct of an employer, a counselling researcher alerting a government agency of their fears for an apparent victim of continuing domestic abuse). In the absence of exigent circumstances, such a breach of privacy should only occur with the authorisation of the Griffith University HREC/ethics reviewers ([see Commentary Inset 5](#)).

[Back to contents](#)

6.0 Human dignity

Even though human dignity is not explicitly discussed by the [National Statement](#) it is arguably implicit to the discussion about respect for persons ([see.....NS.....1.1](#)) and beneficence – especially the risks that relate to devaluation of personal worth/humiliation ([see.NS.2.1](#)).

In practice, consideration of human dignity requires a researcher to consider the degree to which, as a consequence of their participation in a project, they might feel humiliated or at least very embarrassed and/or the degree to which an individual's participation in a project may undermine their sense of personal worth. For some research designs this may be unavoidable. Indeed, in the case of some psychological research this may be an intended outcome (though even in those cases the risk/harm must be justified by the benefits and there should be measures to manage the risks – e.g. debriefing to extinguish those negative feelings).

Unless potential participants should be considered vulnerable ([see 7.0 of this Booklet](#)) it can often be sufficient to forewarn potential participants that the research may involve matters that they may find embarrassing or disrespectful and what (if any) measures are in place to mitigate this.

Commentary Inset 5 – Prior endorsement for not respecting the privacy of participants

The question of whether all, some or none of the [listed arrangements in 5.5](#) need to be in place should be directly based on one ethical reflection and one practical review consideration:

Ethical reflection: A useful way to approach the question about what arrangements need to be in place is to consider it in terms of a sliding scale.

At the high end of the scale is identified personal information, that is sensitive, not already on the public record, probably has some associated risks and individuals are likely to have some concern about the information being shared with other people. In such a case all or most of the arrangements listed at [5.5](#) should be utilised.

At the other end of the scale is genuinely de-identified data, that is reasonably innocuous, and individuals are unlikely to be concerned about it being shared. In such a case only some, or perhaps none of the arrangements listed at [5.5](#) may be necessary.

Between those two ends of the scale only some of the arrangements discussed at [5.5](#) will be necessary.

EXAMPLE – A project involves a physical examination of the muscle tone of the upper thigh and abdomen of participants. For this measurement participants will only be dressed in underwear. This could conceivably raise dignity issues for some people. The consent material should forewarn potential participants about this test and then participants should be reminded about the details of the test when the timing of her/his test is confirmed.

As discussed above the researcher should consider if any measures could be utilised to negate, minimise or otherwise mitigate the dignity concern.

(CONTINUATION OF EXAMPLE ABOVE) – Participants should be informed who will be taking the measurements, the locale where the test will occur, and the tests will be performed. Individuals might be encouraged to bring along a support person and a gown they could wear whenever possible during the test. It would probably be appropriate to remind participants that they can end the test at any point.

Matters for researchers to consider when a project involve dignity concerns include:

- is there a practical alternative to the research design feature that could possibly result in a human dignity concern;
- do the anticipated benefits of the research justify the human dignity issue;
- how will potential participants be warned about the issue and perhaps reminded, so they can elect to self-screen themselves if they are especially concerned by the issue;
- are there precautions that can be used to minimise or otherwise mitigate the issue; and
- is respect for persons given precedence ahead of the objectives of the research?

Experience suggests that considering and addressing such matters not only reduce the likelihood that participants will lodge a complaint about the conduct of a research project, this level of courtesy to individuals can assist in the establishment of a positive relationship between researcher and participant.

[Back to contents](#)

7.0 Vulnerable persons

Throughout the document the **National Statement** contains numerous references to vulnerable persons without actually defining the attributes of a vulnerable person.

Nevertheless, by extrapolation, the attributes that contribute to a person being considered vulnerable include one or more of the following:

- i) A degree of social powerlessness that makes the person less able to make and adhere to a personal decision about what course of action is in their best interest (e.g. a decision whether to participate in a research project);
- ii) A person who is not a confident communicator with the language that will be utilised in the research;
- iii) A person who is intellectually, cognitively or otherwise mentally impaired who may not be able to make discerning judgements about a research project;
- iv) A person less able to resist perceived pressure from authority figures or her/his peers;
- v) A person who is especially dependent on a service, support, benefit or arrangement who may worry about the consequences of her/his participation in a research project that relates to that service, support, benefit or arrangement;
- vi) A person who is more susceptible to the risks associated with a project (either in terms of incidence or the level of harm).

In accordance with the [National Statement](#), the fact an individual should be considered vulnerable, may require extra precautions with regards to:

- how individuals are recruited;
- the need for different consent mechanisms or for supplementary mechanisms to scaffold or otherwise support the consent process;
- if there should be additional screening of the potential participant pool;
- the sufficiency of the mechanisms to minimise, address or otherwise mitigate the risks;
- the need for additional care with regards to the security of any data that is personally identified; and
- if there should be special arrangements with regards to research outputs and the degree to which participants might be identifiable.

When considering these important matters both researchers and ethics reviewers should be careful to avoid paternalism ([see 8.0](#) of this booklet).

[Back to contents](#)

8.0 Paternalism

Internationally, in recent years there has been a persistent expression of disquiet that research ethics review bodies have adopted an overly paternalistic stance with regards to some potential participant populations and some areas of research. Generally, this relates to how some review bodies can be too quick to consider participants as vulnerable, insisting upon additional mechanisms for those participants and being unwilling to believe those participants can make voluntary and informed decisions for themselves.

There are cases where some potential participants should indeed be considered vulnerable, where extra mechanisms are warranted, and extra care with regards to their consent is appropriate. However, this decision should be informed by the following:

- 1) Any assessment of vulnerability should be project specific, and based upon:
 - i. a project's specific research design,
 - ii. the associated risks,
 - iii. the complexity of the issues,
 - iv. what participation involves,
 - v. the recruitment and consent mechanism, and
 - vi. the context in which the research will be conducted.
- 2) Avoid inappropriate generalisations about groups of people, where societal assumptions about vulnerability may be inaccurate, and recognise that different individuals within a group may be less vulnerable than others.
- 3) Respect the right of individuals for self-determination.
- 4) Seek to empower individuals to make discerning decisions for themselves.
- 5) Recognise that the exclusion of some individuals from research may:
 - i. undermine the validity of research findings,
 - ii. exclude an important voice/experience,
 - iii. deny individuals access to the benefits of the research, and

- iv. otherwise be undesirable.

When seeking research ethics review for a project involving the participation of persons who might be considered vulnerable, researchers should share the reflections on the matters above.

[Back to contents](#)

9.0 Respecting beliefs, traditions and cultural protocols

As per **Section 1.11 of the National Statement** when research is conducted with a community or population with well-defined/shared cultural identity, history and/or tradition, an important respect for persons consideration is ensuring that the design and conduct of the research is respectful of the beliefs, traditions and cultural protocols of the participants and communities.

This is not only a key component of the ethical principle of respect for persons, it is likely to be a determiner of community attitudes towards the research (and so, potentially, participation rates), as well as the validity and reliability of the results and/or how the results will be regarded by the community or population.

If a research project is conducted with such a community or population the following questions should be considered by the researcher(s) and the ethics reviewers:

- i) is the researcher a member of the community or population, or does he/she have direct personal knowledge of the community/population;
- ii) (if i was no) does the researcher have experience with conducting respectful research with the community or population;
- iii) (if i was no) will the design and conduct of the research be informed by an appropriate cultural adviser;
- iv) will a community reference group or other process be used to receive ongoing feedback during the conduct of the work;
- v) will the outcomes of the work be returned to the community or population for its benefit; and
- vi) will there be a recognition of the contributions to the research by any advisers or reference group in any outputs arising from the work?

Not every project will necessarily meet all of the statements above, but they should be considered as an aspirational standard for culturally respectful research.

[Back to contents](#)

10.0 Cultural limitations

It should be acknowledged that the concept of respect discussed throughout this booklet (including such matters as privacy and consent from individuals) has most relevance to contemporary Western liberal democracies and draws upon a particular set of social values. This can be problematic when Griffith University human research is conducted in cultural contexts where different values are more relevant (e.g. communities where a more collective perspective of risks/benefits may be more accepted).

If a researcher believes this is the case for one of her/his projects, this should be discussed in the application for research ethics review and the alternate approach to the above discussed and justified.

Such an alternate approach will be considered on a case-by-case basis, very much dependent on the specifics of the project, the relevant experience of the researchers and the justification provided.

[Back to contents](#)

11.0 Human Rights Act 2019

The [Human Rights Act](#) commenced in Queensland on January 1, 2020. The objective of the legislation (as per section 3 of the Act) is to protect and promote human rights, to help build a culture in the Queensland public sector that respects and promotes human rights and to help promote a dialogue about the nature, meaning and scope of human rights. As Griffith is a public sector entity (see section 9(f)), being a statutory body established under Queensland legislation, the Act applies to our research, even if a research project is conducted in another jurisdiction.

The Queensland Human Rights Act protects 23 human rights which should be considered in research design. These human rights include civil and political rights as well as economic, social, and cultural rights. It is important to note that section 17 of the Act provides protection from torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and emphasises the requirement for voluntary, informed consent, particularly in relation to medical or scientific research.

11.1 Human experimentation without consent

The [Queensland Human Rights Act](#) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which it refers are responses to the Declaration of Helsinki and the Nuremberg Code. The Declaration and Code were themselves responses to the egregious human rights abuses identified by the Nuremberg war crimes trials and the investigation of forced human experimentation conducted on concentration camp prisoners without consent.

In accordance with the [Queensland Human Rights Act](#) (section 17(c)), human research involving medical or scientific experimentation or treatment cannot occur without the full, free and informed consent of the participant or a legally authorised alternate (e.g. a legal guardian). Such research interventions would not be eligible for a waiver of consent (under [Chapter 2.3 of the National Statement 2007 updated 2018](#)).

This prohibition does not apply to other kinds of non-interventional clinical research such as chart audits.

11.2 Deception

Pursuant to the [Queensland Human Rights Act](#) (section 17(c)) and sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 of the National Statement, Griffith University human research cannot use active concealment or planned deception in a research project without:

- (i) there being later a mechanism to disclose the deception to participants and an explanation of why the deception was necessary; and
- (ii) providing participants with the ability to withdraw their consent and for their data/information to be deleted from the research dataset after the deception is disclosed.

This prohibition does not apply to other kinds of limited disclosure.

11.3 Further information

Researchers who wish to clarify the degree to which these provisions apply to their work should contact the Research Ethics & Research Integrity team ([see Contacts](#)).

[Back to contents](#)

Contacts

There are a number of resources available to assist researchers formulate an appropriate response to a question or challenge about the design and/or conduct of a project. This includes the Griffith University Research Ethics Manual and the Human Research Ethics Information Sheet Series. These documents are available from the URL below.

Research students – The first point of contact for research students for advice on any research ethics matter is always your supervisors.

REAs – All academic elements of the University have been asked to appoint at least one member of academic staff as a Research Ethics Advisor. REAs are a local contact for advice, information and suggestions. The contact details of all the current REAs can be found on the URL below.

Office for Research – Staff in the Office for Research (see below) are available to advise with the process of lodging an application or other administrative matters, procedural or policy questions. However, you will be asked what advice you have sought or received already (e.g. consultation with the REA for your area).

Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity

Tel: (07) 373 54375

research-ethics@griffith.edu.au

Policy Officer, Research Ethics and Integrity

Tel: (07) 373 58043

Research Ethics Systems and Support Officer

Tel: (07) 373 5 2069

On the ethics web site you will find:

<https://www.griffith.edu.au/research/research-services/research-ethics-integrity/human>

- The other booklets of the *Griffith University Research Ethics Manual*
- The *Griffith University Human Research Ethics Information Sheet Series*
- Either downloadable copies of, or links to, the various application forms
- Contact information for the Research Ethics Advisers (REA) and other contacts
- Educational and other resource material
- Useful external links



Griffith University is commercialising the GUREM through licenses to other universities and research institutions. Consequently, Griffith University staff are asked not to send copies of any booklet to persons external to Griffith. For further information please contact the Office for Research (see above).