HOTELSCHOOL THE HAGUE
Hospitality Business School

Research Ethics Committee

Rules & Regulations

Version: 8 April 2025

Rules and regulations Research Ethics Committee Hotelschool The Hague

Contents

Preface:
The research ethics committee (REC) is an independent committee with its main task to inform, educate and supervise, students and research coaches of Hotelschool The Hague in terms of the ethical and legal aspects of their research (especially when including human participants). In their function, members of the REC organize respective educational content (i.e., workshops, guest lectures). They further can be consulted on the integration of research-related ethical and legal aspects in the curriculum by educational advisors focusing on the integration of (general) ethics in the curriculum.

In addition, the REC assesses research proposals to gauge the ethics of the research methods proposed and investigates whether research subjects and research data are dealt with in an ethical and legal manner (see Appendix for specification of research to be submitted for approval to the REC. In terms of the publication of research results in academic journals, the positive advice of the REC can be used as a letter of approval.

Article 1 General
1.1 In view of the ethical responsibility of Hotelschool The Hague (HTH) in terms of research (as made apparent in the signing of the Dutch code of conduct on scientific integrity in Dutch: de Nederlandse gedragscode wetenschappelijk integriteit) Hotelschool the Hague has appointed the Research Ethics Committee (REC).

Article 2 Goal
2.1 The REC aims to assure that research at Hotelschool The Hague is carried out in a conscientious manner complying with the current legislation, rules and regulations, as well as any relevant codes of conduct.

Article 3 Tasks
3.1 The REC has the following tasks:
a. Advising researchers at HTH on ethical and legal aspects of research proposals in line with current legislation and codes of conduct;
b. Contributing to informing and education on conscientious research in line with current legislation and codes of conduct;
c. Meeting with research centre biannually to benchmark on ethical dilemmas, relevant cases and research integrity and to improve professionalisation through co-construction;
d. Meeting with the Lycar coaches biannually to discuss ethical dilemmas and relevant cases to improve professionalisation;
e. Reporting annually on their work and the results thereof to the Board of Directors (BoD);
f. Giving solicited and unsolicited advice to the Board of Directors on the execution, set-up and infrastructure of research at HTH in terms of topics related to research integrity.

Article 4 Scope of advice
4.1 The REC is open to advice on any research proposals excluding medical research.
4.2 Research proposals (as specified in Appendix) can be assessed by the REC and may be submitted by the researcher or their research coach. Exceptions to this include research that has already been approved by another research ethics committee or by a medical-ethical committee.
The initial check will be through a checklist of question (as specified in Questionnaire in Appendix) which will indicate whether further advice is required.

4.3 Research proposals that might fall under a medical ethical committee will not be assessed and cannot be conducted until such approval has been obtained. The REC will inform the researcher(s) accordingly.

Article 5 Composition and membership of the REC

5.1 The REC consists of a core committee with members that align with the jobs/roles mentioned below. The members of the core committee are appointed by the BoD of HTH. The following jobs/roles are represented in the core committee of the REC:

- Chair
- Regular member
- Legal advisor
- An external member via the ethics committees/ research centres network.

The REC is supported by a secretary.

The regular member is expected to have a solid understanding of research methods and research ethics and will be able to contribute with their knowledge of Hotelschool The Hague's curricula and procedures.

5.2 It is possible for one member to cover a maximum of two roles in the REC.

5.3 Members are appointed for a period of four years renewable for another 4 years. In all other cases, membership is terminated if the member no longer qualifies for membership, or when the member seizes to work at HTH, requests to be dismissed from the committee or if the committee seizes to exists.

5.4 Any vacancies will be filled as soon as possible in compliance with these rules and regulations.

Article 6 Financing

6.1 The members of the core committee are funded by the Board of Directors. The members are entitled to a suitable formation which is determined every four years by the BoD as part of the evaluation of the REC.

6.2 Any training needed to carry out their tasks properly will be facilitated by the budget holders to which the members belong.

Article 7 Responsibilities and duties

7.1 The REC can if they deem this necessary:

a. Invite those who have requested advice to their meeting to provide additional information or clarify existing information;
b. Consult external experts.

7.2 The individual members of the REC are expected to:

a. Familiarise themselves with the documents submitted and to attend the meetings whenever their presence is required (depending on the requests submitted and the agenda of the meeting)
b. Carry out their advising duties with due care;
c. Contribute to the informing and educating on conscientious research within their

programmes;
d. Ensure their expertise is current;
e. Treat the information entrusted to them in a confidential manner and to sign a confidentiality agreement when becoming a member;
f. Inform HTH of any additional roles and responsibilities they take on which could lead to a conflict of interest.

Article 8 Procedure advice request

8.1 Applications for ethical and legal advice can be submitted by any department within the institute as well as by any individual within the institute: researchers, lecturers and other members of staff.

For bachelor and master students following applies:
-In one course, e.g. in the second year Research Course, the issue of ethics in research is part of the class materials.
-A summary of the class materials from this class (e.g. 2 or 3 sheets) will be distributed to all lecturers and these will be asked to include this in their class materials when they assign students to do primary research upon handing in assigned work
-Students will have to tick a pre-requisite box to confirm they are aware of the HTH ethical code for primary research and confirm their work does comply with.

Exceptions are for Lycar research projects for bachelor students and the final thesis for master students and of course all Research Centre projects, and these will fall under the full rule of the rules and regulations of the Research Ethics Committee.

8.2 Applications for advice need to be submitted before the researcher starts the data collection in those cases in which personal data are collected or in which experiments will be held involving human subjects. Only fully filled out applications can be assessed.

8.3 In order to discuss applications for advice, these will need to be submitted at least 10 days prior to a scheduled meeting. Applications can be submitted via the following link: https://uvafeb.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9SkLj6tWYb7Syea. An incomplete or late request will not be discussed.

8.4 In case of any urgent advice requests, the chair of the committee can decide to call an emergency meeting. An urgent request implies that the researcher will suffer a serious setback if the request is not discussed prior to the next scheduled meeting.

8.5 The chair decides if a request falls within the remit of the REC and informs the applicant accordingly. The chair informs the applicant by email about the timeline of the advice request.

8.6 Should the request require the presence of the educational programme representative, said request will be discussed at a REC meeting. Requests with few to no ethical or legal implications are dealt with by the chair outside the meetings. Additional members can be consulted if seen fit. If the representative of an educational programme or another member of the committee is directly involved in the research, then they will abstain from giving their input on the advice request and will excuse themselves from the meeting if applicable.

8.7 The chair prepares a written account of the outcome of a request for advice, and any other committee members involved in issuing an advice. The written report

includes the considerations of the REC, the final point of view of the REC and the advice issued.

8.8 The letter of advice is issued within 10 days after the request was dealt with. The letter is issued by the chair and is sent by email to the applicant and their research coach or project lead.

8.9 The applicant can request further information on an advice within two weeks after receipt of the letter of advice (excluding school holidays).

8.10 The REC expects the researcher (and their coach) to implement any advice given as part of an advice request on a research proposal.

8.11 Any research project which does not fall under 8.2 can be started without previous approval; these projects will be evaluated during regular meetings of the REC.

Article 9 Appeals

9.1 Each applicant has the right to appeal a decision. Researchers have the option to respond to the advice issued by the REC and to provide a further elaboration of the research proposal.

Article 10 Meetings

10.1 The REC meets twice per year. All meeting dates are determined and communicated on an annual basis and in a timely fashion.

10.2 If deemed necessary, the chair can decide to deviate from the meeting schedule. The chair sets the agenda. Members of the REC receive all relevant documents at least one week prior to the meeting in digital format.

10.3 The members of the REC are expected to attend all meetings.

10.4 The meeting schedule is public.

10.5 The meetings of the REC are not public.

10.6 The chair is responsible for minuting the meetings. Meeting minutes are not public.

10.7 Minutes are approved in a subsequent meeting, if needed following relevant adjustments.

Article 11 Confidentiality

11.1 Members of the REC are obliged to treat information they have obtained as part of their role in the REC confidentially. This will apply to all information whether or not confidentiality has been explicitly requested.

11.2 Said confidentiality extends beyond their membership of the REC.

11.3 Confidentiality also applies to any (external) people involved in carrying out any of the tasks of the REC.

11.4 Once their membership has been terminated or expires, members will destroy all documents regarding their work on the REC. Alternatively, all documentation will be handed to the chair of the REC who will ensure the documentation is disposed of.

Article 12 Accountability

12.1 The REC will evaluate their work annually and will create a yearly report thereof.

12.2 The REC will report to the BoD periodically and will produce a yearly report and year plan.

Article 13 Closing Provisions

13.1 These rules and regulations can be adjusted by majority vote of the members of the REC, after which approval of the BoD is requested.

13.2 Proposals for changes can be submitted by any member of the REC and by the BoD of HTH.

13.3 The REC will evaluate their rules and regulations each year.

Article 14 Entry into force

14.1 These rules and regulations enter into force on 8 April 2025

Established by the Board of Directors
Date : 8 April 2025

Consented by the Co-Determination Council
Date : 18 March 2025

Approved by the Board of Trustees
Date : 1 April 2025

Date: 8 April 2025
Version: Final

Appendix 1 Ethical Approval by the Research Ethics Committee (REC)

Researchers and students at the Hotelschool the Hague are required to seek approval for their research from the Research Ethics Committee (REC) before collecting data if:

- they collect new (primary) data from human participants (e.g., via field or laboratory experiments, surveys or interviews), and / or
- they collect and/or use secondary data that contains private, confidential, or potentially sensitive information about research participants (e.g., data related to personal finances, health, relationships, ethnicity, sexual preferences or behaviour, or social media use), and / or
- their research concerns topics that may have legal or ethical implications (e.g., studies on discrimination, crime or tax evasion).

The REC evaluates proposals following the guidelines of the Professional and Ethical Codes for Socio-Economic Research in the Information Society and the Academy of Management's Code of Ethics.

The committee will inform researchers who were seeking approval of their research within two weeks. In some cases, the committee will need additional information before it can decide. Applicants will then be contacted by email to provide this additional information. Applicants whose proposals are not approved by the REC will also be contacted by email.

Exemption Review: proposals that meet certain criteria will receive immediate approval.

Expedited Review: proposals that involve minimal risk will receive expedited review.

Convened/Full Board Review: If the proposed activity does not qualify for exemption or expedited review, the study will be placed on the agenda for the next scheduled REC meeting.

Successful applicants receive a letter with a confirmation of the REC's approval, signed by the chair of the committee.

The ruling of the REC is binding. In case researchers disagree with the evaluation of their proposal, they can appeal to the decision by notifying the chair of REC within two weeks after receiving the decision of the committee.

TO RECEIVE REC approval, please submit your research proposal here:

https://uvafeb.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9SkLj6tWYb7Syea

*The exact questions to be answered are listed below in addition to the applied Research rules.

Questionnaire

Who is the principal investigator on the research project?
The Principal Investigator is responsible for all aspects of research, including the collection, transmission, storage, backup, and security of data and ensuring those listed as key personnel are informed and trained on the procedures related to data security.

_____

Please indicate which type(s) of data you will collect and/or use for your research project

- I create a new dataset by collecting data directly from human participants*
- I create a new dataset but not by collecting data directly from human participants
- I use existing datasets
- I do not collect or use any data for my research (e.g., theoretical / mathematical modelling)

*Data from human participants

- Participants fill out a questionnaire
- Participants participate in an experiment
- Participants are interviewed
- Participants are observed / recorded
- Participants provide biological or genetic data (e.g., saliva, blood samples, fingerprints)
- Other (please specify)

During the research AND the pre-research process (i.e. screening, selection of participants), what (sensitive) personal data relating to subjects are processed? *

A. Name
A. Contact details (e-mail, telephone number, or home address)
A. IP-addresses
A. Student number
A. Citizen service number (BSN)
A. Facial images/video and/or voice recordings
A. Financial details (account number or creditcard number)
A. Copies of passport or other identity documents
B. Location data (GPS)
B. Gender
B. Age in years
B. Date of Birth
B. City or area of residence/postal code
B. Unique identifier (e.g. number that can be used to re-identify a research participant)
B. Number plates and device numbers (e.g. car, mobile phone IMSI)
C. Personal data concerning convictions, criminal offenses or relevant safety precautions
C. Personal data that point to ethnic background
C. Personal data that point to political views
C. Personal data that point to religious or philosophical beliefs
C. Physical or mental health details
C. Data on sexual behaviour or orientation
C. Genetic details
C. Biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a person
C. Trade union
Other (please specify): _____

We distinguish personal data in the following categories:

A. *Directly identifying data*
B. *Data that may contribute to (re-)identification of data-subjects*
C. *Data related to especially sensitive categories*

By "personal data" we mean all information on the basis of which someone can be identified or which can be directly or indirectly traced back to a natural person. This information includes a name, identification number or telephone number, but also a combination of data which can jointly create an image so unique that it can only relate to one person.

Does your dataset contains data that can be traced back to identifiable individuals, either because of direct identifiers (e.g., names, addresses, or pictures) or because of combinations of indirect identifiers (e.g., a combination of age, occupation).

- Yes
- No

*Does the research project involves collaboration with third parties (i.e., industry partners)?

- Yes
- No

If yes
Neutrality is a guiding principle for universities entering into a research partnership with an industry collaborator. Please specify that you and the collaborating partner have agreed to disseminate the findings regardless of potential conflict of interests.

- Yes
- No

Please indicate whether any of the following are true for your research project

- A previously submitted research proposal similar to the current proposal was rejected by the REC or another ethics committee
- The research topic is ethically sensitive and/or may have legal implications (e.g., studies on discrimination, (sexual) harassment, crime, tax evasion)

*Has your research project been evaluated and approved by the ethics committee or Institutional Review Board (IRB) of another university?

- Yes
- No

Select any of the following statements that are applicable to your research:

- The research involves participants that are potentially or in any way vulnerable (e.g. children, patients, elderly, participants with cognitive impairments).
- The research involves participants that are enlisted in the study without their knowledge and consent (e.g., the participants do not know that they are studied in a field experiment).
- The research involves the use of deception of study participants.

If yes, please provide additional information according to research rule #2.

- Drugs, placebos or any other substances (i.e., food, drinks) are administered to the study participants.
- The study involves invasive, intrusive, or potentially harmful procedures of any kind.
- The study may induce unacceptable stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life.

- The research involves the sharing of data or confidential information beyond the initial consent given by any party (e.g., human participants, legal persons, businesses, etc.).
- There are particular groups who are likely to be harmed by the dissemination of the results of this research.
- The proposed research concerns topics that may have legal or ethical implications (e.g., studies on discrimination, minorities, crime, tax evasion)
- A previously submitted research proposal that proposed highly similar research to the presently proposed research was rejected by the EC or any other ethics committee.
- The research deviates from the research rules.

Is there any other reason why you think you should submit your research to the Economics & Business Ethics Committee (EBEC)?*

Please elaborate:*

Appendix 2 Research rules

Research Rule #1: The use of consent

Human subjects regulations allow researchers to obtain written consent in an electronic format. Electronic informed consent (eIC) should be easy to navigate, allowing the user to proceed forward or backward within the system and stop and continue at a later time. For anonymous internet-based surveys or for research that the IRB grants a waiver of signed consent, include "I consent" or "I do not consent" check boxes on the information sheet or consent form for participants to click to indicate their active choice of whether or not they consent to participate.

The informed consent of every individual participating in the conducted research needs to be obtained prior to participation in the conducted research. When obtaining informed consent, researchers have to inform participant about the following:
(1) the expected duration and procedures of the research;
(2) the right to decline to participate and to withdraw from the research once participation has begun;
(3) the foreseeable consequences of declining or withdrawing (if applicable);
(4) potential risks;
(5) potential limits of confidentiality;
(6) recording of voices and images (if applicable);
(7) incentives for participation; and
(8) whom to contact for questions about the research.

Sample CONSENT FORM

STUDY TITLE: Virtual Reality Perceptions and Preferences

PROTOCOL DIRECTOR: Elena Samplewomen

DESCRIPTION: This is a study which attempts to understand consumer perceptions and preferences of virtual reality displays.

PARTICIPANTS: The study is addressed to participants who are residents in the UK.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There is no risk associated with this study. The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are the opportunity to contribute to greater knowledge regarding the understanding of consumer perceptions and preferences of virtual reality displays. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your ability to participate in future research related to the Hotelschool the Hague.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation in this experiment will take approximately 3-4 minutes.

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this study, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Questions, Concerns, or Complaints: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research study, its procedures, risks and benefits, you should ask the Protocol Director, elena.samplewomen@xx.com.
If you have read the information above and would like to participate in the study, please click "I consent". Alternatively, if you do not want to complete the study, please click "I do not consent" and you will be redirected to the end of the study.

- I CONSENT
- I DON'T CONSENT

Research Rule #2: Use of Deception

The REC recognizes that the uses of deception or incomplete disclosure in research are valuable research techniques. However, the use of such techniques raises special issues that the REC will review closely. Deception occurs when participants are deliberately given false information about some aspect of the research. Incomplete disclosure occurs when participants are not given information about the real purpose or the nature of the research.

Justifying the Use of Deception

In the procedures section, justify use of deception and explain why deception is necessary to achieve the goals of the study. Explain if alternative methods not involving use of deception were considered and why these methods are not being used (Sloan & Hull, 2006).

- In the respective section, explain the process to debrief participants. Explain when participants will be debriefed and who will debrief them. Provide copies of the debriefing statement that will be given to participants and the script that will be used by the researchers to orally explain the study (see below for guidance regarding the debriefing), if applicable.
- In the respective section, explain if use of deception is likely to cause the participant psychological discomfort (i.e., stress, loss of self-esteem, embarrassment) while the deception is taking place. Explain how this risk will be minimized during the experiment and after the experiment is complete (i.e. full debriefing) (Sloan & Hull, 2006).
- Complete the waiver of consent section. When participants are not given complete information about the study in the consent document, the REC must waive certain required elements of the consent process (i.e. an explanation of the purpose of the research, a description of the procedures involved, etc.). See below for additional information.

Informed Consent Requirements with Use of Deception in Research

Potential participants should be advised in the consent form that the information they are given is not complete and that they will be debriefed after the research procedures are completed. Address the following when preparing the consent form/information sheet:

- In the "DESCRIPTION" section, provide a truthful and accurate explanation of the purpose of the study to the extent possible, without priming participants or by giving too much of the study away.
- Include the following statement: "Some research requires that the full purpose of the study not be explained before you participate. We will give you a full explanation at the end of the study." Please note: the last sentence can be further customized to say, "We will give you a full explanation as soon as you complete the study."

Debriefing Requirements for Use of Deception in Research

The debriefing is an essential part of the informed consent process and is mandatory when the research study involves use of deception. The debriefing provides participants with a full explanation of the hypothesis being tested, procedures to deceive participants and the reason(s) why it was necessary to deceive them. It should also include other relevant background information pertaining to the study (see below).

Debriefing Requirement

When required elements of informed consent are waived, in accordance with criteria provided in the regulations, participants must be debriefed at the end of the study, when appropriate. When a research study involves use of deception, the EC must find that:

- the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants;
- The research could not practicably be carried out without the requested waiver or alteration;
- If the research involves using identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens, the research could not practicably be carried out without using such information in an identifiable format;
- the waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants; and
- whenever appropriate, the participants will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

As indicated above, the debriefing must occur "when appropriate." It may be inappropriate when: Debriefing regarding the deception may cause more harm than the deception itself. For example, if a student is selected for participation in a study based upon certain physical characteristics (i.e., weight), it might not be appropriate for the debriefing to describe that aspect of the selection process.

The timing of the debriefing is also an important consideration. Generally, the REC expects that participants will be debriefed immediately following their participation in the study. However, it is possible that an immediate debriefing may compromise study results. Participants who have completed the study might tell others about it. If they have been debriefed and have been debriefed may share that information with prospective participants, thus compromising the scientific validity of the study. The REC recommends the use of the following strategies to handle this situation.

If participant names and contact information are collected as part of study procedures, debriefing information can be sent when the study is completed via mail, email or by phone.

If participant names and contact information are not collected researchers can:

- Give participants a URL where they can get debriefing information and a date upon which it will be available.
- Have each participant address an envelope to themselves before they leave the study session and send them debriefing information when the research is completed.

At a minimum, the debriefing statement must include the following:

- Label the form as "Debriefing Statement"
- Study title
- PI name and contact information for follow-up questions
- Thank participants for taking the time to participate in the study
- Explain what was being studied (i.e., purpose, hypothesis, aim). Use lay terms and avoid use of jargon.
- Explain how participants were deceived
- Explain why deception was necessary in order to carry out the research
- Explain how the results of the deception will be evaluated
- Give the participant an opportunity to withdraw his/her consent for use of the recordings and, potentially, withdraw from the study all together, after the true purpose of the study is revealed.The REC suggests that participants be given at least 48 hours to make this decision and provide contact information for whom participants should contact regarding their withdrawal from the study.

Consider adding the following, additional elements, to the debriefing statement:

- Provide references/website for further reading on the topic
- Emphasize that it was the not the gullibility of the participant but rather the skill of the experimenter that is responsible for the success of the deception (Sloan & Hull, 2006).
- If the study did not involve use of audio or video recording but involves sensitive topics, it may be appropriate to give participants an opportunity to withdraw their consent to participate.
- Offer to provide them with the study results

Debriefing as an Educational Tool

Finally, the REC suggests that the debriefing also be used as an educational tool, even when the study does not involve use of deception. Participants should be given a simple, clear and informative explanation of the rationale for the design of the study and the methods used. Ask for and answer participant's questions.

Sloan, L and Hull, J. 2006. Deception of Research Subjects 2nd Edition. In E. A Bankert and R. J. Amdur (Eds.), *Institutional Review Board Management and Function* (210-215). Sudbury, Massachusetts: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

Sample **DEBRIEFING STATEMENT**

Now that you have completed the study, we need to provide you with some additional information to adhere to our ethical research standards.

The real purpose of this study was to better understand how people feel when being exposed to discriminating AI systems. As such, the company used was fictitious, and so was the AI-based recruiting tool. The score that you saw was in fact not a calculated score, but a random number presented to all participants. So, every participant saw he exact same score, regardless of their performance. We needed to use the same score to be able to compare the reaction of participants to an AI used in recruiting (not affected by differences in performance).

We apologize for the deception used and sincerely want to thank you for having participated.

Please contact the protocol director Elena Samplewoman at elenasamplewoman@xx.coml should you want to withdraw your data from the analysis and/or have any additional questions or comments.

Research Rule #3: Pre-registration & Data Accesibility

The Hotelschool The Hague strongly encourages its researchers to pre-register their research. Preregistration is the practice of **documenting your research plan** at the beginning of your study and storing that plan in a **read-only public repository**, such as:

https://aspredicted.org/
https://osf.io/

A very sparse outline of a study plan may be sufficient to increase the discoverability of the research and thus help to address the file drawer effect (Rosenthal, 1979; Franco, Malhotra, & Simonovits, 2014), yet insufficient to assist in evaluating claims resulting from that research. Including a detailed analysis plan in the preregistration may additionally help reduce unintentional false positive inflation of results (Forstmeier, Wagenmakers, & Parker, 2017) and better enable readers to distinguish exploratory from hypothesis-testing elements in a study (Nosek, Ebersole, DeHaven, & Mellor, 2018). Both modes of research are essential for science to advance, but presenting the results of data-dependent, exploratory discoveries using the tools of statistical inference designed for confirmatory studies makes the results appear more surprising, and publishable, which comes at the expense of their credibility (Nosek, Spies, & Motyl, 2012).

While we recommend preregistering all types of research, the most benefits accrue when performing hypothesis testing, confirmatory, research and these benefits are of particular importance to addressing issues of reproducibility in the published literature (Munafò et al., 2017). Our strongest recommendation is therefore to preregister confirmatory research and to include a detailed analysis plan in that preregistration. If setting out on purely exploratory research or pilot studies, preregistration can still help you remember that intention at the end of that project, improve the transparency of your research.

Resources

- Center for Open Science Preregistration information page (containing a much more exhaustive list of resources) - Https://Cos.Io/Prereg/
- "Preregistration: A Plan, Not a Prison" - Https://Cos.Io/Blog/Preregistration-Plan-Not-Prison/

References

- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. Psychological Bulletin, 86(3), 638–641. Https://Doi.Org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638
- Franco, A., Malhotra, N., & Simonovits, G. (2014). Publication bias in the social sciences: Unlocking the file drawer. Science, 345(6203), 1502–1505. Https://Doi.Org/10.1126/Science.1255484
- Forstmeier, W., Wagenmakers, E.-J., & Parker, T. H. (2017). Detecting and avoiding likely false-positive findings – a practical guide. Biological Reviews, 92(4), 1941–1968. Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/Brv.12315
- Nosek, Brian A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(11), 2600–2606. Https://Doi.Org/10.1073/Pnas.1708274114
- Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific Utopia: II. Restructuring Incentives and Practices to Promote Truth Over Publishability. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7(6), 615–631. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1745691612459058
- Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Percie du Sert, N., … Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. Nature Human Behaviour, 1(1), 0021. Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/S41562-016-0021
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant. Psychological Science, 22(11), 1359–1366. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/0956797611417632

Appendix 3 Data Management Procedure:

For students:

1) A Data Management Plan is submitted;
2) Students are assigned a project number (research number);
3) At the end of the project, the files are stored on a secure server for the required period of time (6 years).

For researchers:

1) A Data Management Plan is submitted;
2) At the end of a project, the files are archived on a secure server under the project name and number.

Appendix 4 Members and tasks & responsibilities descriptions:

Chair, Research Ethics Committee:
The Chair is responsible for leading the review and oversight of research involving human subjects, or any other ethical considerations in research conducted. The Chair provides leadership in promoting ethical research practices.

Key Responsibilities:

1. Leadership and Oversight:
    - Lead the Ethical Research Committee (REC) in ensuring ethical compliance with university policies and other relevant research standards.
    - Organize and preside over meetings of the REC, ensuring that reviews are conducted thoroughly, impartially, and in a timely manner.
    - Ensure that all research protocols involving human or sensitive data undergo appropriate ethical review prior to initiation.
2. Review and Decision Making:
    - Provide guidance on the ethical aspects of research proposals, including evaluating the risks and benefits to participants, confidentiality safeguards, informed consent procedures, and compliance with Hotelschool policies.
    - Oversee expedited reviews and full board reviews, ensuring that all research is conducted with a high standard of ethical integrity.
    - Assist board members in reviewing and assessing the ethical dimensions of research studies and making decisions regarding approval, modifications, or rejection of research proposals.
3. Training:
    - Suggest training and guidance to faculty, staff, and students on ethical research practices and regulatory requirements.
    - Foster a culture of ethical awareness and continuous improvement in research ethics throughout the university community.
4. Communication and Reporting:
    - Serve as the main point of contact between the REC, university administration and researchers.
    - Prepare and present reports on the activities of the REC to the university's leadership, ensuring transparency.
5. Conflict Resolution and Ethical Guidance:
    - Address any ethical concerns or complaints raised by researchers, participants, or the broader university community regarding research activities.
    - Provide advisory support for faculty and researchers on best practices for designing ethically sound research, addressing dilemmas, and ensuring integrity throughout the research process.
6. Compliance Monitoring and Auditing:
    - Take appropriate action in cases of non-compliance, misconduct, or deviations from approved protocols, including reporting findings to university administration or regulatory agencies when necessary.

Research Ethics Committee Member
The Research Ethics Board Member is responsible for reviewing research proposals and providing input on the ethical considerations and compliance of research activities within Hotelschool. Members are expected to bring their expertise and perspectives to the review of protocols, address ethical concerns, and ensure the protection of research

subjects.

Key Responsibilities:

1. **Review of Research Protocols:**
    - Participate in the review and evaluation of research proposals, ensuring that they meet ethical standards, including the protection of human subjects, data privacy, and informed consent.
    - Assess the risk and benefit analysis of proposed research, considering the potential impacts on participants, the integrity of the research process, and the broader societal context.
2. **Participate in Meetings and Documentation:**
    - Attend regular (bi-annual) REC meetings and contribute to discussions regarding the ethical implications of research proposals and activities.
    - Contribute to the preparation of meeting minutes and official documentation related to the review process, ensuring that all ethical concerns are clearly articulated and addressed.
3. **Advisory and Collaborative Role:**
    - Advise researchers on best practices for ethical research, offering guidance on how to improve research designs or protocols from an ethical perspective.
    - Collaborate with other board members to ensure thorough, balanced, and fair reviews of research protocols.
    - Participate in discussions about ethical issues, including emerging ethical challenges in new or innovative research fields.
4. **Ethical Training and Education:**
    - Assist in developing and delivering ethical training materials for researchers, faculty, staff, and students to promote awareness of ethical research practices.
    - Provide input on the creation of resources or guidelines to help the university community adhere to ethical standards in research.
5. **Confidentiality and Impartiality:**
    - Maintain strict confidentiality about all research proposals, discussions, and decisions made during the REC meetings.
    - Ensure impartiality in reviewing proposals, providing unbiased feedback and decisions based solely on the ethical principles and regulatory requirements.

Research Ethics Board Member (Legal & Data Aspects):
The Research Ethics Board Member focusing on legal aspects is responsible for advising the REC on legal issues related to the ethical conduct of research, including compliance with relevant laws, regulations, and institutional policies. The member ensures that research practices align with legal standards, particularly in areas such as data privacy, intellectual property, human subjects research, and contractual agreements.

Key Responsibilities:

1. **Participate in Meetings and Documentation:**
    - Attend regular (bi-annual) REC meetings and contribute to discussions regarding the ethical implications of research proposals and activities.
2. **Legal Guidance and Compliance:**
    - Provide legal advice to the REC regarding the interpretation and application of laws and regulations governing research activities.
    - Advise the board on legal issues related to research involving human

subjects and sensitive data.
    - Ensure that research proposals are compliant with relevant legal requirements, including intellectual property laws, non-disclosure agreements, and funding agreements.
    - Review and interpret legal and ethical issues raised in research protocols and ensure they align with university policies and legal frameworks.
3. **Regulatory Compliance:**
    - Assist in ensuring compliance with international research regulations and guidelines, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
    - Evaluate whether research protocols conform to legal requirements for informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, and the protection of vulnerable populations.
    - Monitor changes in laws and regulations affecting university research and recommend necessary updates to policies or procedures.
4. **Ethics Review and Risk Assessment:**
    - Review research protocols to identify legal risks and liabilities, particularly those related to data breaches, intellectual property disputes, and human subjects protections.
    - Advise the board on how to mitigate legal risks in research projects while ensuring that the ethical integrity of the research is maintained.
5. **Legal Aspects of Data Management and Privacy:**
    - Guide the board in reviewing research proposals that involve the collection, storage, and use of sensitive or protected data (e.g., personal data, health information, or student data).
    - Advise on the legal aspects of data sharing, including compliance with data privacy laws (e.g., GDPR) and the ethical implications of data use and storage.
    - Help develop and enforce university policies and procedures regarding data access, data protection, and data retention in research contexts.
6. **Training and Education:**
    - Assist in developing and delivering training on legal and ethical issues in research to faculty, staff, and students, including the legal responsibilities involved in conducting research.
    - Provide guidance on best practices for maintaining legal and ethical compliance in research and ensure that researchers are aware of their legal obligations.
7. **Advisory Role in Ethics Investigations:**
    - Participate in investigations of alleged research misconduct or ethical violations, providing legal expertise.
    - Advise the board on the legal aspects of investigations, including confidentiality, due process, and compliance with legal procedures.
8. **Reporting and Documentation:**
    - Contribute to the preparation of reports on the activities of the REC, particularly regarding compliance with legal requirements and ethical standards.
    - Ensure that all legal documents, approvals, and compliance reports related to research are properly documented and maintained in accordance with university and regulatory guidelines.
9. **Confidentiality and Impartiality:**
    - Maintain strict confidentiality about all research proposals, discussions, and decisions made during the REC meetings.
    - Ensure impartiality in reviewing proposals, providing unbiased feedback and decisions based solely on the ethical principles and regulatory requirements.