Politicians' Theories of Voting Behavior
Ethics Approval Information

POLPOP-II Principal Investigator: Stefaan Walgrave

- Belgium (Flanders): Ethical Advice Committee, Social and Human Sciences, University of Antwerp (SHW_22_032). Contact: stefaan.walgrave@uantwerpen.be

Country-Level Research Ethics Approvals

- Australia: Humanities and Social Sciences DERC, Australian National University (2022-408). Contact: Patrick.Dumont@anu.edu.au
- Belgium (Flanders): Ethical Advice Committee, Social and Human Sciences, University of Antwerp (SHW_22_032). Contact: stefaan.walgrave@uantwerpen.be
- Belgium (Francophone Belgium): Ethical Committee, Social and Human Sciences, Université libre de Bruxelles (R2022-004). Contact: Jean-Benoit.Pilet@ulb.be
- Canada: University of Calgary Research Ethics Board (REB22-0205) and University of Toronto Research Ethics Board (REB 00043361). Contact: jack.lucas@ucalgary.ca
- Czechia: Commission for Ethics in Research of Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University. Contact: linda.coufal@fsv.cuni.cz
- Denmark: Ethics Committee, Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen (2022-04). Contact: anne.rasmussen@kcl.ac.uk
- Germany: Ethical Advice Committee, University of Konstanz (10-2021). Contact: Christian.Breunig@uni-konstanz.de
- Israel: University Committee for the Use of Human Subjects in Research, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (29042022). Contact: liorsheffer@tauex.tau.ac.il
- Luxembourg: LISER Research Ethics Committee. Contact: javier.olivera@nbb.be
- Netherlands: Ethics Committee, Faculty of Behavioral Sciences (2022-PCJ-1477). Contact: R.Vliegenthart@uva.nl
- Portugal: Ethical Committee of the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon (07-2022). Contact: m.m.pereira@lse.ac.uk
- Sweden: Ekprövningsmyndighetens (2022-00734-01). Contact: mikael.persson.3@gu.se
- Switzerland: University of Geneva Ethics Commission (CUREG-2021-10-10), Government of the Canton of Geneva (379-2022). Contact: stefanie.bailer@unibas.ch

Professor Stefaan Walrgave
Department Politieke Wetenschappen
Faculty Sociale Wetenschappen
University of Antwerp

Professor Patrick De Pelsmacker
Vice Chair Ethics Committee for
the Social Sciences and Humanities
City campus
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerpen

REFERENCE
SHW_22_008

Date
28 February 2022

RE: Decision Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities, file SHW_22_008

DEFINITIVE POSITIVE ADVICE

Dear professor,

The independent Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities (EA SHW), installed by the Executive Board of the UAntwerp (03.07.2012) formulates a 'final positive clearance' with regard to your project **"How politicians evaluate public opinion"** (EU-European Research Council (ERC 2020 advanced grnat) - 101018105, PeopleSoft ID Antigoon: 46001).

In its decision making process, the EA SHW is guided by the Royal Decree implementing the Act of 30 July 2018 on the protection of privacy in relation to the processing of personal data; the Royal Decree of May 7, 2004 regarding experiments on the human person; the General Data Protection Regulation; the EU-"Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research"; the deontological code for the researcher (Annex ZAP-statues UAntwerp), and the vademecum of the Belgian Privacy Commission on scientific research and privacy.

The committee has evaluated the following documents:

- Application file for ethical clearance of the Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities of the University of Antwerp (version 2, submission date 15/02/2022)
- Document 3: Consent form for the participant (version 2, submission date 15/02/2022)

The committee formulated no further remarks and therefore concludes to giving a final positive advice.

Kind regards,

Professor Patrick De Pelsmacker
Vice Chair Ethics Committee for the
Social Sciences and Humanities

Human Ethics Protocol 2022/408 - Approval

THIS IS A SYSTEM-GENERATED EMAIL. PLEASE REPLY TO HUMAN.ETHICS.OFFICER@ANU.EDU.AU.

Australian National University

Dear Prof Patrick Dumont,

Protocol: 2022/408
How politicians evaluate public opinion

I am pleased to advise you that your Human Ethics application received approval from the Humanities & Soc Sciences DERC - 13 October 2022 Chair on .

Please read the following information about the conditions of your approval according to the NHMRC National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007):

- The committee will request a brief report on your project regularly. Reporting periods depend on the level of risk and the length of the project, but at minimum you will need to complete an annual monitoring report in ARIES. A guide on how to do so is here.
- If you need to make any changes to your protocol in the course of your research, you must notify the committee of the proposed variation and receive approval from the Chair beforehand. A guide on how to do so is here.
- Please notify the committee immediately if you receive any complaints about the research work or any unforeseen events occur that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the research work.
- If the project finishes before the projected end date, or if you are leaving ANU, please notify the Ethics Office so the record can be closed.
- The validity of the current approval is five years maximum from the date shown approved. For longer projects you are required to seek renewed approval from the Committee.

If you have any questions, please contact the Ethics Office at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au.

All the best with your research,

Research Ethics Office
Research Services Division

Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board
Research Services Office
2500 University Drive, NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
Telephone: (403) 220-4283/6289
cfreb@ucalgary.ca

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS REVIEW

The Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board (CFREB), University of Calgary has reviewed and approved the below research. The CFREB is constituted and operates in accordance with the current version of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS).

Ethics ID:	REB22-0205
Principal Investigator:	Jack Lucas
Co-Investigator(s):	
Student Co-Investigator(s):	
Study Title:	POLPOP: Survey of Canadian Elected Politicians
Sponsor:	University of Toronto

Effective: 10-Jun-2022 **Expires:** 10-Jun-2023

Restrictions:

This Certification is subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is granted only for the research and purposes described in the application.
2. Any modification to the approved research must be submitted to the CFREB for approval.
3. An annual application for renewal of ethics certification must be submitted and approved by the above expiry date.
4. A closure request must be sent to the CFREB when the research is complete or terminated.

Approval by the REB does not necessarily constitute authorization to initiate the conduct of this research. The Principal Investigator is responsible for ensuring required approvals from other involved organizations (e.g., Alberta Health Services, community organizations, school boards) are obtained.

Approved By: **Date:**

Jenny Godley, PhD, Chair, CFREB 10-Jun-2022 1:01 PM

Note: This correspondence includes an electronic signature (validation and approval via an online system).

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Ethics Committee – project approval notification

Ethics reference number	2022-004
Project title	How politicians evaluate public opinion
PI name	Anne Rasmussen Gregory Eady

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 5A
1353 KØBENHAVN K

ajlo@ifs.ku.dk

REF: AJLO

Thank you for submitting your ethics checklist to the Department's Ethics Committee.

The Committee has approved your proposed research on February 21, 2022.

On behalf of the Ethics Committee,

Asmus Leth Olsen

Deputy Head of Department
Professor WSR

POLPOP2 Elite survey + interviews

Project details

ERB number	2022-PCJ-14777
ID	14777
Title	POLPOP2 Elite survey + interviews
Department	Political Communication and Journalism
Status	Approved
Created	2022-03-11 13:38:54
Modified	2022-03-11 13:38:54

Project collaborators

Emma van der Goot	Owner	e.s.vandergoot@uva.nl	020 525 3680
Rens Vliegenthart	Supervisor	R.Vliegenthart@uva.nl	0205253680
Toni van der Meer	Supervisor	G.L.A.vanderMeer@uva.nl	do not call
Bert Bakker	Ethics Member	B.N.Bakker@uva.nl	do not call

General

Responsible researcher

Rens Vliegenthart, Toni van der Meer

Who conducts the research?

Emma van der Goot

Research location

Den Haag/Uva/teams

Brief project description

This application deals with the data collection of the second part of the Polpop project (See ERB 2018-PCJ-9117 for the first part). We will collect data among the Dutch members of Parliament. Politicians are asked to participate both in a closed survey (on a laptop) and in an open interview (face-to-face or online) that will be recorded. The data collection is part of a larger project led by Stefaan Walgrave from the University of Antwerp. The elite survey and interviews will be conducted in 13 different countries. Politicians will be asked questions concerning public opinion, representation, the media, and political conflicts (see attachments 3 and 4 for more information on the survey and interview questions. The survey questions are still in English and will be translated and adapted to the Dutch context).

Expected duration of the project

We expect data collection to take approximately four months.

Expected number of participants

40

For the survey, our aim is 40 participants. For the survey in combination with the open-ended questions, our aim is at least 15 participants.

This project is comparable with the following ERB-project(number)

2018-PCJ-9117 We've also attached the ethical application from the University of Antwerp (document 5)

Privacy

Will you collect data from human participants?

Yes

Have you discussed privacy related issues concerning this project with the data steward?

Yes, please explain what was discussed in a comment

I have had an appointment with Amber and Aino on April 5. We discussed data management and data sharing. With regard to data management, we agreed that I will store all data on Research Drive, except for the email addresses I use to contact politicians. The email addresses will be stored on One Drive. All documents will be encrypted. For data sharing, I will need to contact the legal department to review the DPA that's in place. Moreover, if the data collection is finalized, we will need to assess what pseudonymized data can or cannot be shared. Depends a bit on who participates.

What personal data relating to subjects are recorded?

- Name
- Political preferences
- Facial images/video/sound recordings

We will collect the survey data with personalized Qualtrics links and we will, thus, be able to connect the name of politicians to their answers. We have to do so because we need to merge the survey answers from the politicians with their bio-data (e.g., age or years experience which can be found online). In order to comply with GDPR guidelines, we will pseudonymize personal information. To do so, we will create a file (1) that contains politicians' names, their bio-data, and an identifier for all the politicians (every politician will be assigned a four-digit code in this second file). We will have a second file (2) that contains only the identifiers and bio-data that is categorized (so age in categories) and all the survey answers. Also on party level we will categorize the data (for example left-wing or right-wing party instead of party name). So it will no longer be possible to connect a participant to a specific party in the second file (2) that is used for the analyses. File 1 and 2 will be stored on Research Drive with separate encryption. We will also collect political preference: politicians will be asked to position themselves on a left to right scale. They will provide informed consent for sharing this information. Finally, the audio recordings contain personal information in the sense that politicians' voices may be recognizable. We will ask politicians' permission to record their answers to open questions. We will use Teams for the recording and we will have a backup voice recorder as well (this voice recorder will be protected). The Teams' recording will be encrypted and saved on Research Drive with politicians' id tagged. If everything went well with Teams, the backup on the separate voice recorder will be deleted immediately. Teams will automatically transcribe the interview. Any identifiable information in the transcripts (e.g., such as names) will be immediately omitted from the transcripts by the researcher. The transcripts will only be tagged with the identifier we made for the politicians. If the data collection is finalized the audio recordings will be transferred to the ASCoR repository, encrypted, and deleted from the previous storage space. Importantly, the student assistants who will help with the surveys/interviews will all sign a confidentiality clause and they will use protected UvA computers to conduct the interviews.

What subject groups are relevant?

- Other, please explain in a comment below

All members of parliament (MPs), ministers, and party leaders will be invited to participate in a (survey-)interview. They are invited for a face-to-face meeting of 45 minutes/one hour in which they complete a closed survey on a laptop (+/- 30 minutes) and take an open interview (+/- 30 minutes). Members of Parliament (MPs), ministers, and party leaders are a well-defined set of participants that can easily be identified. Their contact details can simply be found online on the websites of the respective parliaments, governments, and parties. The participants are thus all adults; they are no vulnerable groups or persons.

Are the subjects in the study actively consenting to participation?

Yes

Before taking the survey and/or interview, MPs get access to an information sheet containing: (1) a description of the study and its general goals, (2) the appointing authority (i.e. the respective university), (3) the duration of the study, (4) information about voluntary participation, (5) the responsible ethics committee, (6) details on the use and processing of confidential information, and (7) contact details of the local researchers and of the local data protection officer (DPO). We used the template provided by the ethics committee of the University of Amsterdam as a basis. Having had the opportunity to read the information sheet, MPs must give their informed consent before taking the survey and/or interview. Again, we used the template provided by the ethics committee of the University of Amsterdam as a basis.

Responsible party

- Myself, as a researcher employed by the UvA together with an external non-commercial party outside the EU (e.g., researchers from a non EU-university (please supply contact information in a comment below))

The University of Antwerp is the controller, and Stefaan van Walgrave the PI: stefaan.walgrave@uantwerpen.be. Politicians in 13 other countries are surveyed. Pseudonymization will happen by the local teams (the data processors). A data processing agreement will be concluded between the controller (University of Antwerp) and all local data processors, specifying the terms and conditions in detail. The University of Antwerp is currently drafting this DPA, and they use the DPA of the European Council as a basis. We have attached the draft (document 6). We will hand over the pseudonymized data to the University of Antwerp research team after signing this DPA. The other countries will do the same and the Antwerp team merges the data into a comparative dataset that is also stored safely on the protected servers of the University of Antwerp. This is the comparative dataset that is used for analysis. The researchers from the local universities (the data processors) will get access to the comparative, pseudonymized dataset. The details regarding this data transfer are included in a data processing agreement that is concluded between the universities: the Standard Contractual Clauses are complied with. Note that only researchers affiliated with POLEVPOP/POLPOP2 can get access to the comparative dataset. The other researchers that are involved are the following: In Australia the project team consists of Patrick Dumont, Marija Taflaga and Annika Werner (Australian National University), in Francophone Belgium of Jean-Benoit Pilet, Nathalie Brack, Laura Jacobs, Sacha Rangoni, Awenig Marie, Pauline Claessens (Université Libre de Bruxelles), in Canada of Peter Loewen (University of Toronto) and Jack Lucas (University of Calgary), in the Czech Republic of Ondrej Cisar and Tomas Dvorak (Charles University Prague), in Denmark of Anne Rasmussen, Gregory Eady, Sarah Valentina Møller, and Daniel Cruz (University of Copenhagen), in Germany of Christian Breunig, Maj-Britt Sterba (University of Konstanz) and Stefanie Bailer (University of Basel), in Israel of Lior Sheffer (Tel Aviv University) and Eran Amsalem (Hebrew University Jerusalem), in Luxembourg of Javier Olivera (Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research), in the Netherlands of Rens Vliegenthart, Toni van der Meer, Emma van der Goot (University of Amsterdam), and Marc Van de Wardt (Free University of Amsterdam), in Norway of Yvette Peters (University of Bergen), in Portugal of Miguel Pereira (University of Southern California) and Jorge Fernandes (University of Lisbon), in Sweden of Mikael Persson (University of Gothenburg), and in Switzerland of Fréderic Varone (University of Geneva) and Pirmin Bundy (University of Bern).

Who will be processing the data?

- Myself, as a researcher employed by the UvA together with an external non-commercial party in the EU (e.g., researchers from another EU-university (please supply contact information in a comment below))

Please see the previous comment for further information.

Legal agreement data processing?

No

We have not yet signed the DPA yet. We will do so as quickly as possible. The University of Antwerp is currently drafting the DPA. Afterward, we will get it approved by the legal department. No data will be shared before signing the DPA.

Where are the data to be stored?

- Storage on a UvA storage service: e.g. FMG / Science Storage
- Surfdrive
- Other, please explain in a comment below

All the following files will be stored on the Research Drive with separate encryption (different passwords): (1) the file with the survey answers and a personal id for the politicians; (2) the file with the politicians' names, biodata, and personal id; (3) interview recordings of which the title will mention the personal ids of the politicians; (4) transcriptions of the interviews with the personal ids mentioned. Only Rens, Toni, and I will be able to access the data. The student assistants can only upload the data on Research Drive. The email addresses and contact details that we use to reach out to politicians will be stored on OneDrive so that the student assistants can modify the document. This document will be encrypted and deleted as soon as the data collection is finished. The final pseudonymized, comparative dataset will be stored on the University of Antwerp's secure servers with the following security measures: automatic backup, firewall, anti-malware, role-based restricted access, and password protection. The details regarding data transfer will be included in the data processing agreement.

What security measures have been taken?

- Pseudonymisation (identifying data has been replaced with pseudonyms)
- Encryption (e.g. password, private key)

See also previous comments about the collection of personal data. We will pseudonymize the data. We will have a file with the personal data (i.e., politicians' names and their biodata) and a personal identifier, and a file that contains the identifier, categorized bio-data, and survey answers. This last file will be used for the analyses. All files are stored on Research Drive with encryption (e.g., with Veracrypt) and each encryption will use a different password. Second, the pseudonymization of the open interview material (i.e., audio recordings) will be done in the transcription process. The recordings will be transcribed by Teams and student assistants will check whether this transcription went well and is complete. The student assistants will sign a declaration of confidentiality (document 7). Any identifiable information will immediately be omitted from the transcripts. The transcripts will be tagged with an identifier and stored on Research Drive with encryption. If necessary, the audio recordings will be stored on the ASCoR repository (Amber is looking into this). The data collection, i.e. the interviews, will be conducted on protected UvA laptops. For the backup audio recording, we will use protected audio recorders. The backup recording will be deleted if everything went well with the official recording.

Ethics Checklist

A1. Medical or non-Medical

Yes, it falls into category D

A2.0 Juveniles

All are at least 16 years

A2.1 Recruitment of test subjects

Yes, state the manner referred to in a comment

MPs, party leaders, and ministers will initially be recruited via email to participate in

the project. The email will contain information about the project's goals and an invitation for a face-to-face meeting with a researcher or student assistant. Email invitations can be followed up by a personal phone call from a researcher or student assistant. Participation is entirely voluntary. If a politician is willing, a date, time and place are set for the (survey-)interview. All e-mails and phone numbers are public and available on the Official Tweede Kamer website. All personal data, in this case the specific contact details of each potential interview participant, will be meticulously recorded in an Excel file. Contact details include the name of the politician, professional mail address, work telephone number, etc. These data will be stored on OneDrive and password protected. Personal (email) correspondence between potential interviewees and the researchers will be deleted after project completion. Contact details will be archived (and not deleted) as we deal with publicly available information on politicians' and parties' web pages and official government documents.

A3. Voluntary participation

Yes

A4. Screening of test subjects

Screening is unnecessary, because there is no risk or adverse effects at all involved in participating

A5. Chance findings

No, it is not possible for the method to result in chance findings

A6. Informed consent

Yes, please submit the factsheet and the form to be signed as attachment

A7. Anonymity

Yes

A8. Misleading test subjects and debriefing procedure

Participants will be misled in a way that fully satisfies the conditions listed below, explain in a comment

The study contains a survey experiment in the sense that different groups of respondents get a different 'treatment' in the second module (see document 3). We will compare the answers of these groups with each other. However, we do not use real deception. We never provide false information about the goal of a question. There is never fake or false information involved. This is why no risks are involved in the procedure. The only (subtle) deception is that participants are unaware of the intended between-group comparison. We gauge respondents' opinions on redistributive issues after priming half of the respondents to think about poor people in their social network, while the other half are primed to think about rich people. Our goal is to see if priming poor people affects respondents' redistributive preferences. Respondents will be debriefed about this when they complete de survey.

A9. Information presented to research participants

No

A10. Reward/compensation

Yes, explain what reward(s) participants will receive in a comment

Participants will receive no financial compensation but merely a small gift as a token of our appreciation for their voluntary participation (probably a bag of chocolates, or Rens wants to give them a copy of his book "Doen, Durven of de Waarheid. Democratie in Digitale Tijden")

B1 Specific types of standard research

Yes, explain the type of standard research

B1d - The research includes a standard questionnaire and interviews of adults who are contacted via email and phone. Participation is completely voluntary and participants will be notified that they have the right to stop the survey or interview at any time and without any risks. They will not be named in the final results and no

data will be traceable to the individual participant.

Attachments

Extended Research Description (not obligatory)

1. Document 5_Ethical application_University of Antwerp POLEVPOP Elites.docx
2. Document 6_ Draft Data Processing Agreement.docx
3. Polpop_Document 3_questions elite survey_Netherlands.pdf
4. Polpop_Document 4_ Open Interview Vragen.docx
5. Polpop_Document 7_Confidentiality agreement.docx

Factsheet and Informed Consent Form

1. Polpop_Document 1_Information sheet_ ASCoR template.docx
2. Polpop_Document 2_Geïnformeerde toestemming_ASCoR template.docx

Debriefing document

1. Polpop_Document 8_Debriefing.docx

Project history

2022-04-05 20:54:20 Project approved [by Bert Bakker]

Dear Emma, fijn dat dit allemaal goed op de rit staat nu. Succes met de studie!

I hereby acknowledge **receipt** of your project, archived as 2022-PCJ-14777.
Please use this file number in future correspondence.

Your project has been reviewed. Because it qualifies as “standard research”, your project is hereby approved.

Modifications of the concerning project should be submitted to the Ethics Review Board for evaluation.

Regards,

Bert Bakker,
Member of the Ethics Review Board.

Addressed to project owner e.s.vandergoot@uva.nl

2022-04-05 15:54:00 Message [by Emma van der Goot]

Dag Bert, Ik heb een meeting gehad met Amber en Aino (de nieuwe data steward). We hebben data management en data sharing besproken. Ik heb de privacy tab aangepast. Dit zijn de belangrijkste zaken op een rijtje: 1. We gaan de data opslaan op Research Drive. 2. De emailadressen komen wel op One Drive want die gebruiken de student-assistenten om de politici mee te benaderen. Wordt verwijderd zodra data verzameling is afgerond. 3. Alle bestanden worden met encryptie opgeslagen. 4. De DPA wordt bekeken door de juristen. 5. We sturen information sheet al van te voren naar de politici. 6. Amber checkt of het benoemen van het delen van data ook in de informed consent moet. Staat wel uitgebreid in the information sheet. 7. De student-assistenten gaan werken op beveiligde UvA laptops. 8. Als we de data verzameling hebben afgerond, maken we een afspraak om te kijken wat er precies gedeeld mag worden met Antwerpen. Hopelijk is het helder zo. Heel erg bedankt voor het meedenken en je snelle reacties!! Hartelijke groet, Emma

Addressed to ethics member B.N.Bakker@uva.nl

2022-04-05 15:47:07 Project submitted for review. [by Emma van der Goot]

2022-04-05 15:14:39 Project approval reverted. [by Emma van der Goot]

2022-03-31 14:25:14 Project approved [by Bert Bakker]

Dear Emma, helemaal goed zo. Als er uit gesprek met Amber nog opmerkingen komen, dan kan je het project

even terugtrekken, aanpassen (leg in berichtje aan mij even uit wat er anders is) en weer opnieuw indienen. Dan keur ik snel weer goed.

I hereby acknowledge **receipt** of your project, archived as 2022-PCJ-14777.
Please use this file number in future correspondence.

Your project has been reviewed. Because it qualifies as "standard research", your project is hereby approved.

Modifications of the concerning project should be submitted to the Ethics Review Board for evaluation.

Regards,

Bert Bakker,
Member of the Ethics Review Board.

Addressed to project owner e.s.vandergoot@uva.nl

2022-03-31 14:03:07 Project submitted for review. [by Emma van der Goot]

2022-03-31 14:01:28 Message [by Emma van der Goot]

Hoi Bert, Bedankt voor je snelle reactie. 1. Ik heb het aangepast 2. Ik heb dit naar aanleiding van ons gesprek bewust weggelaten. Het idee was dat ze alleen tijdens het onderzoek konden stoppen. Maar aangezien het niet anoniem is, heb ik nu de termijn van 7 dagen genoemd. 3. Ik heb dit gespecificeerd. 4. We hebben besloten de debriefing aan het einde van de survey te doen. Hartelijke groet, Emma

Addressed to ethics member B.N.Bakker@uva.nl

2022-03-30 20:09:49 Additional information requested [by Bert Bakker]

Dear Colleague,

I hereby acknowledge receipt of your project, archived as 2022-PCJ-14777.
Please use this file number in future correspondence.

In order to review your project, you are kindly requested to provide the following additional information or clarification:

1. Ik zou de informed consent ondertekenen met de naam van Rens. Die van jou, Toni en Marc komen verder niet in het document voor. Of zeggen, namens het onderzoeksteam (Emma, Toni & Marc), Prof Rens Vrliegenthart

2. Standaard in onze ethiek is dat je tot 7 dagen na afloop van het onderzoek je medewerking mag opzeggen. Jullie zeggen nu eigenljik dat dit oneindig is. Maar dat is natuurlijk niet zo: op een gegeven zitten mensen in de data en zijn jullie daar mee aan het analyseren en publiceren. Dus ik zou toch voor zijn dat jullie de normale termijn hanteren. Als jullie een langere termijn dan de normale 7 dagen willen, dan moet ik dat even bespreken. Zou je dit even kunnen laten weten.

3. Ik zou graag zien dat jullie specifieker zijn in welke gegevens jullie koppelen aan de data. Nu zeg je commissies als voorbeeld. Maar eigenlijk moet je natuurlijk precies aangeven wat je gaat doen. Vooral omdat dit de reden is dat jullie de persoonsgegevens behouden. Eigenlijk is het zo dat mensen bij de informed consent al moeten weten wat jullie gaan koppelen. Mijn vraag dus: ik zou graag zien dat jullie specifieker maken welke gegevens jullie gaan koppelen (sorry had dit de eerste keer al moeten zien).
4. De debriefing is goed. Maar waarom stuur je die pas weken later. Het risico is natuurlijk dat mensen die niet meer lezen. Je zou ook gelijk een debriefing kunnen doen en een paar weken later de resultaten opsturen.

To submit the above-mentioned information, your project appears in the list of "Open Projects" under "My Projects".
Here you can modify the general project information as well as the required file attachments and resubmit your project for review.

Please keep in mind that formal approval by the Ethics Review Board is mandatory before starting your research.

Regards,

Bert Bakker,

Member of the Ethics Review Board

Addressed to project owner e.s.vandergoot@uva.nl

2022-03-29 21:32:10 Project submitted for review. [by Emma van der Goot]

2022-03-29 17:21:12 Message [by Emma van der Goot]

Hoi Bert, Bedankt voor je uitgebreide feedback. Ik heb een afspraak gemaakt met Amber op 5 april om data opslag en delen te bespreken. Ik heb dit aangegeven onder de privacy tab. Ik zal het aanpassen als ik meer duidelijkheid heb. Ik heb verder de volgende dingen aangepast: 1) Ik heb een nieuwe information sheet en informed consent toegevoegd. Ik heb hiervoor de AScoR templates gebruikt. In het consent form van AScoR staat niks over het publiekelijk toegankelijk maken van de data dus dat heb ik nog toegevoegd. 2) De "small gift" die we aan deelnemers geven is hoogstwaarschijnlijk een zakje chocolaatjes. Eventueel wil Rens een kopie geven van zijn boek "Doen, Durven of de Waarheid. Democratie in Digitale tijden". Ik heb dit er nu bij gezet. 3) Module 2 van de vragenlijst is inderdaad een soort experiment. Ik heb een beschrijving en debriefing toegevoegd. Het zou heel erg fijn zijn als je alvast naar de ethische aspecten kan kijken van ons onderzoek. We zijn van plan vanaf 11 april contact op te nemen met de politici. Dank alvast!! Hartelijke groet, Emma

Addressed to ethics member B.N.Bakker@uva.nl

2022-03-21 21:33:59 Additional information requested [by Bert Bakker]

Dear Emma,

Heel leuk project. En dank voor de uitgebreide informatie. Als je wilt kunnen we ook even bellen over de aanvraag. Het is best complex wat je doet zeker omdat julllie dit project natuurlijk in meerdere landen doen. Ik denk dat het vooral belangrijk is dat je even met Amber de privacy afstemt. Maar ook over de consent en factsheet heb ik wat vragen. Nogmaals, wees welkom om hier even verder over te praten. Het doel is er uitkomen en dat gaat ook zeker lukken.

Groeten,

Bert

I hereby acknowledge receipt of your project, archived as 2022-PCJ-14777.
Please use this file number in future correspondence.

In order to review your project, you are kindly requested to provide the following additional information or clarification:

Privacy
1. Je geeft aan nog niet met Amber gesproken te hebben. Ik raad je aan dat wel te doen. Met data overgeven aan andere universiteit is het wel belangrijk dat tijdig te bespreken.

2. Je schrijft dat deelnemers anoniem zijn in de dataset. De vragenlijst suggereert dat wel. Maar toch wel 2 vragen. Ten eerste de open antwoorden: daar zou je toch wel snel identificeerbare informatie in kunnen vinden? Als dat zo is, dan zouden er mogeljik wel bedenkingen zijn om de interviews openbaar te delen. Ten tweede het linken van andere data: gaan jullie ook partij, geslacht, leeftijd aan de vragenlijst linken? IN dat geval lijkt het mij dat politici makkelijk herleidbaar zijn. Denk dat het wel goed is om de mate waarin je deze data kan delen met Amber door te nemen.

2. Zou je ook het idee om data buiten de EU te delen met Amber kunnen bespreken. Daar zitten misschien wel wat meer haken en ogen aan.

3. Heb je met Amber besproken hoe je geluidsopnames moet opslaan. Daar moet je meestal goed oppassen. Is OneDrive genoeg?

Information sheet

1. Ik snap dat jullie niet de UvA formulieren gebruiken, maar het is wel een beetje lastig. Want daardoor zitten er ook wat secties in waar ik vragen bij heb. Met name het stuk over de processing van personal data is echt wel een beetje anders dan dat we normaal doen. Je belooft mensen anonimiteit, maar je geeft ook aan dat mensen zich nog kunnen bedenken. Maar zoals ik je privacy sectie lees, kan dat helemaal niet meer. Ook mis ik een termijn. Op de UvA is dit tot 7 dagen na afloop van de studie. Je moet daar wel een termijn aan geven. Maar ik vraag me vooral af, of je dit uberhaupt kan doen. Ik denk ook dat ik, als jullie af willen wijken van de UvA procedures, dit wel even met Amber en Eva bespreek voordat ik het goed kan keuren.
2. In het algemeen vraag ik me af of je niet beter vanuit het UvA consent formulier kan beginnen te werken.
3. Wat is de “small gift” die jullie aan de deelnemers geven
4. Je schrijft “We, the researchers, will inform all participants in case of an unforeseen early termination of the study”. Wat bedoel je hiermee? En tot hoeveel tijd na deelname kan je dit doen? Daarnaast; hoe ga je dit doen als politci volledig anoniem meedoen?
5. De privacy policy is wel heel kort (1 zin). Volgens mij staat er informatie in de stukken daaronder die eigenlijk bij privacy hoort.
6. Je schrijft “It only contains an identification code, that can only be used for specific research purposes (e.g. to link new data), by researchers from the University of Amsterdam working on the project.” Wat voor nieuwe data bedoel je? En zouden deelnemers daar geen consent voor moeten geven?
7. Ik mis in de studiebeschrijving dat mensen ook worden geinformeerd dat je hun persoonlijkheid gaat meten
8. Ik weet niet zeker of ik de vragenlijst goed begrijp, maar zijn de vragen in module 3 niet experimenteel? Of zit daar wel randomisatie in? Zo ja, dan moet je politici achteraf wel informeren dat het een experiment was waar ze aan mee hadden gedaan en eventueel debriefen. Maar nogmaals, weet niet zeker of ik de vragenlijst goed lees.

Consent form

1. Waarom gebruik je het consent form van de UvA niet? Er staat hier bijvoorbeeld niet in dat mensen wel of niet hun toestemming nog kunnen terugtrekken. Ook staat er niets over het publiekelijk beschikbaar maken van de data. Kijk even naar ons consent form. Het is niet erg als de bewoordnigen anders zijn, maar alle aspecten moeten er wel instaan.
2. Benoemt “belgie”, moet Nederland zijn

To submit the above-mentioned information, your project appears in the list of “Open Projects” under “My Projects”.
Here you can modify the general project information as well as the required file attachments and resubmit your project for review.

Please keep in mind that formal approval by the Ethics Review Board is mandatory before starting your research.

Regards,

Bert Bakker,

Member of the Ethics Review Board

Addressed to project owner e.s.vandergoot@uva.nl

2022-03-14 19:55:13 Ethics member Bert Bakker (bbakker2) has been added. [by Bert Bakker]

2022-03-14 14:33:43 Project submitted for review. [by Emma van der Goot]

- **2022-03-11 13:42:00** Collaborator Toni van der Meer (gvdmeer2) gets role Supervisor [by Emma van der Goot]

- **2022-03-11 13:41:54** Collaborator Toni van der Meer (gvdmeer2) has been added as Assistant [by Emma van der Goot]

- **2022-03-11 13:41:09** Collaborator Rens Vliegenthart (rvliege1) gets role Supervisor [by Emma van der Goot]

- **2022-03-11 13:41:03** Collaborator Rens Vliegenthart (rvliege1) has been added as Assistant [by Emma van der Goot]

- **2022-03-11 13:38:54** Project created [by Emma van der Goot]

Ref. 07/2022

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

The Ethics Committee of the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon (ICS-ULisboa) reviewed the request submitted by Jorge Fernandes concerning a study commissioned by the University of Antwerp (Belgium) and funded under the ERC project "POLEVPOP: How politicians evaluate public opinion" (Grant Agreement 101018105).

The study aims at understanding how policymakers appraise and process public opinion and how such evaluations affect their action. It consists of a survey of political actors, namely elected members of the Portuguese National Assembly as of May 2022 (N=~190). Participants will be asked to answer a 30-minute computer-assisted questionnaire, followed by an open-ended interview of approximately the same duration. Interviews will be audio-recorded with the consent of the respondent.

The request for ethics assessment was submitted along with the informed consent template, an information sheet for participants, and an example of debriefing, explaining how and why certain questions are administered to some participants. The debriefing will be sent to participants a few weeks after the data collection and will showcase preliminary results from the survey.

Taking into account the documentation presented, the Ethics Committee positively assess the request, based upon the following:

- Participation is fully voluntary and relies on principles of confidentiality and transparency: participants are appropriately informed of the aims of the study and about their right to withdraw at any time with no consequences;
- The rights and freedoms of data subjects are guaranteed throughout the study, as complete information is provided on the collection and processing of data (including personal data), risks and benefits of participation, privacy, withdrawal procedures, and re-use of data;
- A list of contacts of both the commissioning entity (University of Antwerp) and subcontracted entity (ICS-ULisboa) is provided to address specific requests by the respondents;
- Participants are selected according to their status as elected officials. As such, they do not belong to vulnerable groups, and the risk of stigmatisation or psychological distress is very unlikely;

- Personal data that may be collected for research purposes will be anonymised by design during the study (for close-ended questions) or pseudonymized afterwards (for transcripted interviews), and kept separate from the answers provided;
- Appropriate measures will be adopted to ensure data protection, as data will be stored in a password-protected computer with limited access under the responsibility of the data processer, and no connection to external or internal networks;
- Research data will only be made available after complete anonymisation;
- Data will be transferred between ICS-ULisboa and the contracting institution, which is based in an EU Member country, and thus subject to the same regulations concerning data collection and processing for research purposes;
- Appropriate follow-up is provided to participants, even in the absence of deception as regards the experimental part of the study (with some questions being asked to only some participants).

Recommendations by the Ethics Committee:

- Given the relatively small sample size (N=~190), pseudonymisation may not be sufficient to prevent the identification of some respondents. This risk - albeit low and with minor potential consequences - should be stated in the information sheet. Alternatively, other relevant information, such as participants' membership in a parliamentary committee or party (especially for parties with fewer MPs) could also be anonymised or minimised, if the project objectives allow so;
- Data archives must be encrypted and transferred to the contracting institution safely, either by hand, in password-protected storage, or remotely via institutional emails. In this case, encrypted archives should be uploaded onto a secure server and passwords/keys sent separately to the research coordinator.

Taking into account the documentation provided and the recommendations above, the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon considers that all conditions are set for compliance with both the European Union and the Portuguese law and with standard ethical requirements for the practice of research with human beings.

The Ethics Committee is available to provide guidance and advice during and after the implementation of the study, whenever requested and appropriate/necessary.

Pellegrino Cammino

(on behalf of the Ethics Committee)

Lisbon, 23 June 2022

FAKULTA
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD
Univerzita Karlova

V Praze dne 14. března 2022

Věc: Stanovisko Komise pro etiku ve výzkumu

V souladu se svým úkolem, tj. „posoudit etické aspekty cílů, metodologie i potenciálních dopadů výzkumných projektů, resp. jejich částí, které uskutečňují nebo na nichž se podílí řešitelé, kteří jsou zaměstnanci UK zařazení na fakultě, a studenti fakulty“, projednala Komise pro etiku ve výzkumu Fakulty sociálních věd Univerzity Karlovy 14. března 2022 žádost „Jak politici evaluují veřejné mínění“, č. j. 35/2022, podanou profesorem Ondřejem Císařem, Ph.D. K uvedené žádosti, jejíž podoba je na vyžádání k dispozici na Fakultě sociálních věd, nemá Komise pro etiku ve výzkumu žádné výhrady a vyslovuje souhlas se záměry předkladatelky.

Komise pro etiku ve výzkumu schvaluje žádost bez výhrad.

S pozdravem,

Mgr. Eva M. Hejzlarová, Ph.D.
Členka Komise pro etiku ve výzkumu
Fakulta sociálních věd Univerzity Karlovy

FAKULTA
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD
Univerzita Karlova

Prague, 14th March 2022

Subject: The Statement of the Commission for Ethics in Research

In line with its task, i.e. „to assess the ethical aspects of the objectives, methodology and potential impacts of research projects, or their parts, which are carried out or attended to by the researchers who are staff members of Charles University employed at the faculty and faculty students“, the Commission for Ethics in Research on 14th March 2022 discussed the application “How politicians evaluate public opinion“, No. 35/2022, submitted by Professor Ondřej Císař, Ph.D. The Commission for Ethics in Research has no reservations to the application and approves of the applicants’ intentions.

The Commission for Ethics in Research approves of the application without reservations.

Yours sincerely,

Mgr. Eva M. Hejzlarová, Ph.D.
Member of the Commission for Ethics in Research
Faculty of Social Sciences Charles University

Professor Stefaan Walgrave
Department Politieke Wetenschappen
Faculty Sociale Wetenschappen
University of Antwerp

Professor Patrick De Pelsmacker
Vice Chair Ethics Committee for
the Social Sciences and Humanities
City campus
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerpen

REFERENCE
SHW_22_032

Date
21 February 2022

RE: Decision Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities, file SHW_22_032

DEFINITIVE POSITIVE ADVICE

Dear professor,

The independent Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities (EA SHW), installed by the Executive Board of the UAntwerp (03.07.2012) formulates a 'final positive clearance' with regard to your project **"How politicians evaluate public opinion (second part of the POLEVPOP-project)"** (EU-European Research Council (ERC 2020 advanced grant) 101018105, PeopleSoft ID Antigoon: 46001).

In its decision making process, the EA SHW is guided by the Royal Decree implementing the Act of 30 July 2018 on the protection of privacy in relation to the processing of personal data; the Royal Decree of May 7, 2004 regarding experiments on the human person; the General Data Protection Regulation; the EU-"Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research"; the deontological code for the researcher (Annex ZAP-statues UAntwerp), and the vademecum of the Belgian Privacy Commission on scientific research and privacy.

The committee has evaluated the following documents:

- Application file for ethical clearance of the Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities of the University of Antwerp (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 1: Methodology of the study (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 2: Information sheet for the participant (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 3: Consent form for the participant (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 4: A list of ethical committees to which the research proposal will be presented (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 5: All information that will be used to contact the participants (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 6: All the diaries or surveys that will be presented to the participants, if already available (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 10: Debriefing form (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 11: Example of the confidentiality statement for all employees in non-anonymous (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)
- Document 12: Contracts between the researchers and sponsors (version 1, submission date 8/02/2022)

The committee formulated no further remarks and therefore concludes to giving a final positive advice.

Kind regards,

Professor Patrick De Pelsmacker
Vice Chair Ethics Committee for the
Social Sciences and Humanities

Universität Konstanz

Universität Konstanz · Box 214 · 78457 Konstanz

Herr
Prof. Christian Breunig

per Mail

Sabine Schieß
Institutional review board
(Ethics Commission)
Universitätsstraße 10
D-78464 Konstanz
+49 7531 88-5264
Fax +49 7531 88-3727

sabine.schiess@uni-konstanz.de
www.uni-konstanz.de

16.12.2021

IRB statement 45/2021

To whom it may concern,

in my function as Secretary of the Institutional Review Board (Ethics Committee) of the University of Konstanz I would like to deliver the following statement regarding the research project **"Understanding the Political Behavior and Attitudes of Citizens and Political Elites"** which was reviewed at the University of Konstanz as the relevant and most proximate academic institution with an standing institutional review board:

The IRB of the University of Konstanz has evaluated the above proposal, and we have come to the conclusion that this project, and the procedures for data handling and storage are in full line with the ethics regulations of the University of Konstanz.

This judgement was made on following basis:

- the text of the proposal,
- the specific regulations of the University for ethical experimentation and data storage,
- Declaration of Helsinki in its current version as developed by the World Medical Association,
- Relevant national and international law and regulations

The University has an administrative procedure in place that will ensure that ethics guidelines as laid down in German national law and international conventions are fully respected. The IRB will ensure and, if necessary, enforce the proper adherence to ethics guidelines during and after the project.

This IRB approval is given for five years for the specific evaluated project. This also includes additions and prolongations of the project of a technical nature that do not affect the overall judgement of ethical issues and the state of safety of the study subjects.

Sincerely,
Sabine Schieß

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

29.4.2022

לכבוד

דר' ערן אמסלם

המחלקה לתקשורת ועיתונאות

הפקולטה למדעי החברה

האוניברסיטה העברית

שלום רב,

הנני להודיעך בזה שהועדה העליונה לאתיקה של מחקרים בהם מעורבים בני אדם אישרה את הצעת מחקרך שנושאה: **"כיצד פוליטיקאים אומדים את דעת הקהל."**

תוקף האישור עד 28.4.2023

מספר אישור 29042022

האחריות על ביצוע המחקר בהתאם לכללי האתיקה כפי שהוצגו בבקשה הנה בידי החוקרים ויש לדווח על כל שינוי.

בברכה ובהצלחה,

דר' חגית מגן
יו"ר ועדת האתיקה העליונה לניסויים בהם מעורבים בני אדם
האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
ישראל

BESLUT

2022-04-27

Sökande forskningshuvudman
Göteborgs universitet

Forskare som genomför projektet
John Mikael Persson

Projekttitel
Forskningsprojektet: Hur utvärderar politiker opinionen? (POLPOP)

Uppgifter om ansökan
Ansökan inkom till Etikprövningsmyndigheten 2022-02-07 och blev valid 2022-02-10. Ansökan är tidigare behandlad vid sammanträde 2022-03-02. Av myndigheten begärd komplettering enligt beslut inkom 2022-04-04.

Etikprövningsmyndigheten beslutar enligt nedan.

BESLUT

Etikprövningsmyndigheten godkänner den forskning som anges i ansökan, med följande villkor:

I all information till forskningspersoner ska:

1. Det anges att Göteborgs universitet är personuppgiftsansvarig.
2. Den rättsliga grunden för inhämtande av personuppgifter anges (t.ex. "Behandlingen av dina personuppgifter är nödvändigt för att utföra forskning som är av allmänt intresse (GDPR, Art 6, p. 1e).").
3. Hänvisningar till konfidentialitet och liknande begrepp strykas då dessa är missvisande eller felaktiga.
4. Skrivningen "Vi kan vi luta oss på en mångårig praxis vid Göteborgs universitet där riksdagsledamöternas integritet erhållit ett hundraprocentigt skydd i de många tidigare riksdagsundersökningarna, samt rigorösa riktlinjer vad det gäller datahantering i det internationella samarbetet." ändras eller tas bort då den kan uppfattas som otillbörlig påverkan.

Det här beslutet kan överklagas hos Överklagandenämnden för etikprövning. Hur man överklagar framgår av bifogad anvisning.

På Etikprövningsmyndighetens vägnar

Johan Rosén
Ordförande

Beslutet har fattats av följande personer:

Ordförande
Johan Rosén

Ledamöter med vetenskaplig kompetens
Önver Cetrez (religions- och kulturpsykologi, vetenskaplig sekreterare)
Niklas Jakobsson (Nationalekonomi, föredragande)
Maria Eriksson Baaz (Statsvetenskap)
Minna Gräns (rättsvetenskap)
Maria Harder (Vårdvetenskap)
Katarina Hjelm Katarina Hjelm (Migration, hälsa, omhändertagande vid kronisk sjukdom)
Anna Lindström (social interaktion)
Oscar Pripp (Etnologi, antropologi, sociologi)
Per Sandin (Tillämpad etik, bioetik, miljöetik, forskningsetik)

Ledamöter som företräder allmänna intressen
Kenneth Johannesson
Håkan Krantz
Pia Milton
Gert Ohlsson
Rigmor Åkesson

Beslutet sänds till

Ansvarig forskare: John Mikael Persson

Forskningshuvudmannens företrädare: Mikael Gilljam

Hur man överklagar Etikprövningsmyndighetens beslut

Vem får överklaga?

Det är forskningshuvudmannen som får överklaga Etikprövningsmyndighetens beslut om det har gått sökanden emot. Överklagandet ska vara skriftligt. Skrivelsen ska vara undertecknad av behörig företrädare för forskningshuvudmannen.

Om forskaren överklagar ska en fullmakt från forskningshuvudmannen bifogas.

När ska beslutet senast överklagas?

Överklagandet ska ha kommit in till Etikprövningsmyndigheten inom tre veckor från den dag då forskningshuvudmannen fick del av beslutet.

Vad ska överklagandet innehålla?

Överklagandet ska innehålla uppgifter om

1. klagandens namn, person- eller organisationsnummer, adress, telefonnummer och e-postadress
2. det beslut som överklagas (dag för beslut, projekttitel och diarienummer)
3. hur ni anser att myndighetens beslut ska ändras och skälen till att beslutet bör ändras.

Var ska överklagandet skickas?

Överklagandet ska ställas till Överklagandenämnden för etikprövning. Men det ska skickas eller lämnas till Etikprövningsmyndigheten.

Om överklagandet har kommit in i rätt tid överlämnar myndigheten överklagandet och handlingarna till Överklagandenämnden för etikprövning.

RÉPUBLIQUE ET CANTON DE GENÈVE

ARRÊTÉ

autorisant l'Université de Genève à traiter des données personnelles dans le cadre d'un projet de recherche portant sur la question de savoir comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques (traitement de données personnelles sensibles à des fins générales de recherche scientifique, art. 41, al. 1, let. f LIPAD)

9 février 2022

LE CONSEIL D'ÉTAT

Vu la demande d'autorisation formée le 2 novembre 2021 par l'Université de Genève (UNIGE), soit pour elle Monsieur Frédéric Varone, professeur auprès de la Faculté des sciences de la société, pour le traitement de données personnelles sensibles à des fins générales de recherches scientifiques, conformément à l'article 41, alinéa 1, lettre f de la loi sur l'information du public, l'accès aux documents et la protection des données personnelles, du 5 octobre 2001 (LIPAD ; A 2 08), dans le cadre d'un projet de recherche portant sur la question de savoir comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques :

Considérant ce qui suit;

En fait

1. Le projet de recherche est une étude académique visant à déterminer comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques
2. Il combine un questionnaire anonyme auprès des citoyennes et des citoyens afin de connaitre leur opinion sur des enjeux politiques et un questionnaire anonyme auprès des parlementaires destinés à savoir comment ces derniers traitent l'opinion publique telle que mesurée par le questionnaire auprès des citoyennes et des citoyens.
3. Le projet de recherche se conduit sur une durée de presque 5 ans, soit d'avril 2022 à décembre 2026.
4. Le projet vise à impliquer un échantillon de 10'000 citoyens et citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires fédéraux et les parlementaires des cantons de Berne et de Genève.
5. Les types de données qui seront collectées sont décrites dans un document annexe au présent arrêté et faisant partie intégrante de ce dernier.
6. Toutes les données seront, dans un premier temps, "pseudo-anonymisées" ce qui signifie que chaque personne participant à ce projet de recherche se verra attribuer un code d'identification unique qui sera connu uniquement des membres de l'équipe de recherche de l'Université de Genève, à savoir le Professeur Frédéric Varone et Monsieur Julien Jaquet, post-doctorant. Un tel procédé permettra aux membres de l'équipe de recherche de recontacter les personnes qui participent à la recherche à intervalles réguliers pendant la durée de la recherche.
7. Le code d'identification unique est stocké dans une base de données cryptées et distincte de la base contenant l'ensemble des données personnelles et personnelle sensibles.
8. Les données seront stockées pendant toute la durée de la recherche sur un serveur sécurisé de l'UNIGE.
9. Dès la fin du projet de recherche, la totalité des données seront anonymisées afin qu'aucune des personnes dont les chercheurs auront eu accès aux données ne soit identifiée ou identifiable et seront archivées sur un serveur institutionnel de l'UNIGE.
10. Les codes d'identification seront détruits dès la publication des résultats de recherche.
11. Aucune des données ne sera communiquée à une autre institution ou personne.
12. Les résultats de la recherche seront publiés à des fins de valorisation scientifique uniquement et excluront la possibilité d'identifier toute personne.
13. Interpellé par le Conseil d'Etat, le Préposé à la protection des données et à la transparence (PPDT) a rendu, le 12 janvier 2022, un préavis favorable au traitement, par l'UNIGE, des données personnelles et des données personnelles sensibles dans le cadre du projet de recherche portant sur la question de savoir comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques.
14. Ce préavis est toutefois soumis à la condition que l'Université, qui sous-traite une partie de la recherche à l'organisme FORS, centre de compétences suisse en sciences sociales, domicilié à Lausanne, conclut un contrat de sous-traitance avec ledit organisme imposant à ce dernier le respect des conditions prévues à l'article 41 LIPAD.

En droit

15. Dans le cadre de l'accomplissement de leurs tâches légales, les institutions publiques sont en droit de traiter des données personnelles à des fins générales de statistique, de recherche scientifique, de planification ou d'évaluation de politiques publiques, pour leur propre compte ou celui d'une autre institution publique en ayant la mission légale, aux conditions cumulatives que (art. 41, al. 1, let. a à e LIPAD) :
    a) le traitement de données personnelles soit nécessaire à ces fins;
    b) ces données soient détruites ou rendues anonymes dès que le but du traitement spécifique visé le permet;
    c) les données collectées à ces seules fins ne soient communiquées à aucune autre institution, entité ou personne;
    d) les résultats de ce traitement ne soient le cas échéant publiés que sous une forme excluant la possibilité d'identifier les personnes concernées;
    e) le PPDT en soit préalablement informé avec les précisions utiles sur le traitement qu'il est prévu de faire des données personnelles et sa nécessité.
16. Par ailleurs, le traitement, par une institution publique, de données personnelles sensibles ou impliquant l'établissement de profils de la personnalité doit préalablement faire l'objet d'une autorisation du Conseil d'Etat, qui doit requérir le préavis du PPDT et assortir au besoin sa décision de charges ou conditions (art. 41, al. 1, let. f LIPAD).
17. En l'espèce, le projet de recherche s'inscrit dans le cadre des missions de l'UNIGE.
18. Les données collectées sont des données personnelles sensibles et apparaissent nécessaires au projet de recherche portant sur la question de savoir comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques.
19. Seuls deux chercheurs, à savoir le responsable de projet et un membre de son équipe, ont accès à ces données, ces dernières n'étant communiquées à aucune autre institution ou personne.
20. Les résultats de ce traitement sont publiés sous une forme excluant la possibilité d'identifier les personnes concernées.
21. Le PPDT a rendu, le 12 janvier 2022, un préavis favorable.
22. Pour ces raisons, le Conseil d'Etat donnera une suite favorable à la demande d'autorisation formulée par l'UNIGE.

Par ces motifs,

ARRÊTE :

L'UNIGE est autorisée à traiter pour son compte et à des fins générales de recherche scientifique, des données personnelles sensibles récoltées dans le cadre du projet de recherche portant sur la question de savoir comment les citoyens et les citoyennes ainsi que les parlementaires traitent les informations disponibles sur l'opinion publique par rapport à des enjeux concrets de politiques publiques, moyennant le respect des conditions suivantes :

- l'UNIGE, pour la partie de la recherche sous-traitée à l'organisme FORS, centre de compétences suisse en sciences sociales, domicilié à Lausanne, doit conclure un contrat de sous-traitance avec ledit organisme imposant à ce dernier le respect des conditions prévues à l'article 41 LIPAD;
- l'UNIGE doit s'assurer que les données transmises dans la base de données commune aux diverses institutions menant la recherche répondent aux exigences d'anonymisation, et que le recoupement d'informations sur les personnes interrogées ne permette pas leur ré-identification.

Conformément aux articles 132 de la loi sur l'organisation judiciaire, du 26 septembre 2010 (LOJ ; E 2 05), 17, alinéa 4, 62, alinéa 1, lettre a, 64 et 65 de la loi sur la procédure administrative, du 12 septembre 1985 (LPA ; E 5 10), la présente décision est susceptible de faire l'objet d'un recours auprès de la chambre administrative de la Cour de justice (rue de Saint-Léger 10, case postale 1956, 1211 Genève 1) dans les 30 jours qui suivent sa notification. Le délai est suspendu pendant les périodes prévues à l'article 63, alinéa 1 LPA. L'acte de recours doit être signé et parvenir à l'autorité ou être remis à son adresse à un bureau de poste suisse ou à une représentation diplomatique ou consulaire suisse au plus tard le dernier jour du délai avant minuit. Il doit indiquer, sous peine d'irrecevabilité, la décision attaquée, les conclusions de la recourante ainsi que les motifs et moyens de preuve. La présente décision et les pièces dont dispose la recourante doivent être jointes à l'envoi.

Communiqué à :

CHA	1 ex.
DIP	1 ex.
PPDT	1 ex.
Intéressé	1 ex.

CONSEIL D'ÉTAT
RÉPUBLIQUE ET CANTON DE GENÈVE

Certifié conforme,

La chancelière d'Etat :

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

COMMISSION UNIVERSITAIRE POUR UNE RECHERCHE ETHIQUE A GENEVE (CUREG)

Monsieur
Frédéric Varone

PROJET SOUMIS À LA COMMISSION D'ÉTHIQUE UNIVERSITAIRE
ATTESTATION SUITE À LA PROCÉDURE FAST TRACK

FICHE DE DÉCISION CUREG-2021-10-106

1. Titre de la recherche	How do Swiss representatives evaluate public opinion signals, and with what effects?
2. Financement	-
3. Chercheur(s) responsable(s)	Frédéric Varone

Date de dépôt à la Commission	11 octobre 2021
Modifications demandées par la Commission	oui ☐ non ☒
Les cas échéant, modifications introduites et transmises à la Commission le	
Décision	Le projet est **accepté.**
Date	22 octobre 2021
Date de fin du projet[1]	30 septembre 2026
Signature de la présidente :	Brigitte Galliot

N.B. *Les éventuels changements (intitulé, nombre de sujets, durée de la recherche, ...) devront être signalés à la Commission. Le formulaire ad hoc peut être demandé à l'adresse « commission-ethique@unige.ch ».*

[1] La date de fin du projet correspond également à la date de validité de la présente approbation.