Ethical Principles of the Acoustical Society of America for Research Involving Human and Non-Human Animals in Research and Publishing and Presentations

The Acoustical Society of America has endorsed the following ethical principles associated with the use of human and non-human animals in research, and for publishing and presentations. The principles endorsed by the Society follow the form of those adopted by the American Psychological Association (APA), along with excerpts borrowed from the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS). The ASA acknowledges the difficulty in making ethical judgments, but the ASA wishes to set minimum socially accepted ethical standards for publishing in its journals and presenting at its meetings. These Ethical Principles are based on the principle that the individual author or presenter bears the responsibility for the ethical conduct of their research and is publication or presentation.

Authors of manuscripts submitted for publication in a journal of the Acoustical Society of America or presenting a paper at a meeting of the Society are obligated to follow the ethical principles of the Society. Failure to accept the ethical principles of the ASA shall result in the immediate rejection of manuscripts and/or proposals for publication or presentation. False indications of having followed the Ethical Principles of the ASA may be brought to the Ethics and Grievance Committee of the ASA.

APPROVAL BY APPROPRIATE GOVERNING AUTHORITY

The ASA requires all authors to abide by the principles of ethical research as a prerequisite for participation in Society-wide activities (e.g., publication of papers, presentations at meetings, etc.). Furthermore, the Society endorses the view that all research involving human and non-human vertebrate animals requires approval by the appropriate governing authority (e.g., institutional review board [IRB], or institutional animal care and use committee [IACUC], Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act [HIPPA], or by other governing authorities used in many countries) and adopts the requirement that all research must be conducted in accordance with an approved research protocol as a precondition for participation in ASA programs. If no such governing authority exists, then the intent of the ASA Ethical Principles described in this document must be met. All research involving the use of human or non-human animals must have met the ASA Ethical Principles prior to the materials being submitted to the ASA for publication or presentation.

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH-Applicable when human subjects are used in the research

Research involving the use of human subjects should have been approved by an existing appropriate governing authority (e.g., an institutional review board [IRB]) whose policies are consistent with the Ethical Principles of the ASA or the research should have met the following criteria:

Informed Consent

When obtaining informed consent from prospective participants in a research protocol that has been approved by the appropriate and responsible governing body, authors must have clearly and simply specified to the participants beforehand:

1. The purpose of the research, the expected duration of the study, and all procedures that were to be used.
2. The right of participants to decline to participate and to withdraw from the research in question after participation began.
3. The foreseeable consequences of declining or withdrawing from a study.
4. Anticipated factors that may have influenced a prospective participant's willingness to participate in a research project, such as potential risks, discomfort, or adverse effects.
5. All prospective research benefits.
6. The limits of confidentiality.
7. Incentives for participation.
8. Whom to contact for questions about the research and the rights of research participants. That office/person must have willingly provided an atmosphere in which prospective participants were able to ask questions and receive answers.

Authors conducting intervention research involving the use of experimental treatments must have clarified, for each prospective participant, the following issues at the outset of the research:

1. The experimental nature of the treatment;
2. The services that were or were not to be available to the control group(s), if appropriate;
3. The means by which assignment to treatment and control groups were made;
4. Available treatment alternatives if an individual did not wish to participate in the research or wished to withdraw once a study had begun; and
5. Compensation for expenses incurred as a result of participating in a study including, if appropriate, whether reimbursement from the participant or a third-party payer was sought.

Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research

Authors must have obtained informed consent from research participants prior to recording their voices or images for data collection unless:

1. The research consisted solely of naturalistic observations in public places, and it was not anticipated that the recording would be used in a manner that could have caused personal identification or harm, or
2. The research design included deception. If deceptive tactics were a necessary component of the research design, consent for the use of recordings was obtained during the debriefing session.

Client/Patient, Student, and Subordinate Research Participants

When authors conduct research with clients/patients, students, or subordinates as participants, they must have taken steps to protect the prospective participants from adverse consequences of declining or withdrawing from participation.

Dispensing With Informed Consent for Research

Authors may have dispensed with the requirement to obtain informed consent when:

1. It was reasonable to assume that the research protocol in question did not create distress or harm to the participant and involves:
    a. The study of normal educational practices, curricula, or classroom management methods that were conducted in educational settings
    b. Anonymous questionnaires, naturalistic observations, or archival research for which disclosure of responses would not place participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damage their financial standing, employability, or reputation, and confidentiality
    c. The study of factors related to job or organization effectiveness conducted in organizational settings for which there was no risk to participants' employability, and confidentiality.
2. Dispensation is permitted by law.
3. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Offering Inducements for Research Participation

(a) Authors must not have made excessive or inappropriate financial or other inducements for research participation when such inducements are likely to coerce participation.

(b) When offering professional services as an inducement for research participation, authors must have clarified the nature of the services, as well as the risks, obligations, and limitations.

Deception in Research

(a) Authors must not have conducted a study involving deception unless they had determined that the use of deceptive techniques was justified by the study's significant prospective scientific, educational, or applied value and that effective non-deceptive alternative procedures were not feasible.

(b) Authors must not have deceived prospective participants about research that is reasonably expected to cause physical pain or severe emotional distress.

(c) Authors must have explained any deception that was an integral feature of the design and conduct of an experiment to participants as early as was feasible, preferably at the conclusion of their participation, but no later than at the conclusion of the data collection period, and participants were freely permitted to withdraw their data.

Debriefing

(a) Authors must have provided a prompt opportunity for participants to obtain appropriate information about the nature, results, and conclusions of the research project for which they were a part, and they must have taken reasonable steps to correct any misconceptions that participants may have had of which the experimenters were aware.

(b) If scientific or humane values justified delaying or withholding relevant information, authors must have taken reasonable measures to reduce the risk of harm.

(c) If authors were aware that research procedures had harmed a participant, they must have taken reasonable steps to have minimized the harm.

HUMANE CARE AND USE OF NON-HUMAN VERTEBRATE ANIMALS IN RESEARCH-Applicable when non-human vertebrate animals are used in the research

The advancement of science and the development of improved means to protect the health and well being both of human and non-human vertebrate animals often require the use of intact individuals representing a wide variety of species in experiments designed to address reasonable scientific questions. Vertebrate animal experiments should have been undertaken only after due consideration of the relevance for health, conservation, and the advancement of scientific knowledge. (Modified from the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) document: "International Guiding Principles for Biomedical Research Involving Animals-1985").

Research involving the use of vertebrate animals should have been approved by an existing appropriate governing authority (e.g., an institutional animal care and use committee [IACUC]) whose policies are consistent with the Ethical Principles of the ASA or the research should have met the following criteria:

The proper and humane treatment of vertebrate animals in research demands that investigators:

1. Acquired, cared for, used, interacted with, observed, and disposed of animals in compliance with all current federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and with professional standards.
2. Are knowledgeable of applicable research methods and are experienced in the care of laboratory animals, supervised all procedures involving animals, and assumed responsibility for the comfort, health, and humane treatment of experimental animals under all circumstances.
3. Have insured that the current research is not repetitive of previously published work.
4. Should have used alternatives (e.g., mathematical models, computer simulations, etc.) when possible and reasonable.
5. Must have performed surgical procedures that were under appropriate anesthesia and followed techniques that avoided infection and minimized pain during and after surgery.
6. Have ensured that all subordinates who use animals as a part of their employment or education received instruction in research methods and in the care, maintenance, and

handling of the species that were used, commensurate with the nature of their role as a member of the research team.
7. Must have made all reasonable efforts to minimize the number of vertebrate animals used, the discomfort, the illness, and the pain of all animal subjects.
8. Must have made all reasonable efforts to minimize any harm to the environment necessary for the safety and well being of animals that were observed or may have been affective as part of a research study.
9. Must have made all reasonable efforts to have monitored and then mitigated any possible adverse affects to animals that were observed as a function of the experimental protocol.
10. Who have used a procedure subjecting animals to pain, stress, or privation may have done so only when an alternative procedure was unavailable; the goal was justified by its prospective scientific, educational, or applied value; and the protocol had been approved by an appropriate review board.
11. Proceeded rapidly to humanely terminate an animal's life when it was necessary and appropriate, always minimizing pain and always in accordance with accepted procedures as determined by an appropriate review board.

PUBLICATION and PRESENTATION ETHICS-For publications in ASA journals and presentations at ASA sponsored meetings

Plagiarism

Authors must not have presented portions of another's work or data as their own under any circumstances.

Publication Credit

Authors have taken responsibility and credit, including authorship credit, only for work they have actually performed or to which they have substantially contributed. Principal authorship and other publication credits accurately reflect the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their relative status. Mere possession of an institutional position, such as a department chair, does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to the research or to the writing of the paper should have been acknowledged appropriately, such as in footnotes or in an introductory statement.

Duplicate Publication of Data

Authors did not publish, as original data, findings that have been previously published. This does not preclude the republication of data when they are accompanied by proper acknowledgment as defined by the publication policies of the ASA.

Reporting Research Results

If authors discover significant errors in published data, reasonable steps must be made in as timely a manner as possible to rectify such errors. Errors can be rectified by a correction, retraction, erratum, or other appropriate publication means.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

If the publication or presentation of the work could directly benefit the author(s), especially financially, then the author(s) must disclose the nature of that conflict:

1. The complete affiliation(s) of each author and sources of funding for the published or presented research should be clearly described in the paper or publication abstract.
2. If the publication or presentation of the research would directly lead to the financial gain of the author(s), then a statement to this effect must appear in the acknowledgment section of the paper or presentation abstract or in a footnote of a paper.
3. If the research that is to be published or presented is in a controversial area and the publication or presentation presents only one view in regard to the controversy, then the existence of the controversy and this view must be provided in the acknowledgment section of the paper or presentation abstract or in a footnote of a paper. It is the responsibility of the author to determine if the paper or presentation is in a controversial area and if the person is expressing a singular view regarding the controversy.

Approved by the Executive Council on 19 November 2004