

Informed Consent and Consent Forms^{1,2}

Joan E. Sieber* and Robert J. Levine[†]

*California State University, East Bay [†]Yale University

Informed consent is a communication process by which researchers reach agreement with people about whether they wish to participate in research. Confusing informed consent with a signed consent form may violate the ethical intent of informed consent, which is to communicate clearly and respectfully, foster trust, comprehension and good decision making, and ensure that participation is voluntary. Consent forms are frequently written in “legalese” and are often long, complex, inappropriate to the culture or language of the potential subject, insulting and virtually impossible for most people to comprehend. They convey to some the impression that signing such a formal-looking document commits them to participation. Singer³ and Trice⁴ have found that a significant number of subjects refuse to participate in surveys, studies or experiments if required to sign a consent form, but would gladly participate otherwise. Among subjects who willingly sign documents, most sign the consent form without reading it.

How has this come to pass? Early concern with ethics of human research was about biomedical research and focused on the necessity of obtaining informed consent. Over the decades, the elements of informed consent have grown in number, as has the idea that informed consent is a form that is to be signed by the subject. According to the federal regulations for research involving human subjects [46.117(a)]:

Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, informed consent shall be documented by the use of a written consent form approved by the IRB and signed by the subject or the subject’s legally authorized representative. A copy shall be given to the person signing the form.

However, many researchers and their IRBs fail to recognize that 46.117(c) provides for waiver of signed consent forms:

(c) An IRB may waive the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for some or all subjects if it finds either:

- (1) That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research, and the subject’s wishes will govern, or*
- (2) That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.*

The reason for obtaining a signed consent form has always been much more to protect the researcher and the institution than to serve the interests of the research subject. In case the subject claims later that consent was inadequate or omitted entirely, the researcher can counter by showing the form, in essence, a signed receipt for the information. In recent years another need for protection of the institution has become evident; we refer to OHRP’s (Office of Human Research Protection’s) highly publicized and costly sanctions against a few research institutions. Understandably, in the light of these severe penalties, IRBs and research administrators consider it in their self interest to make highly conservative decisions. Since IRBs must take steps to justify waiving documentation of informed consent by deeming the research

¹Members of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Working Group chaired by Felice Levine helped to develop these ideas. For information on the Working Group, see http://www.area.net/humansubjects/SBS_WG_Summary.htm

² A version of this paper appears in the APS Observer, APS Observer, 17, (4), 25-26.

³ Eleanor Singer, “Informed consent: Consequences for response rate and response quality in social surveys,” *American Sociological Review*, 43, 144-162 (1978).

⁴ T. R. Trice, “Informed Consent. VII. Biasing of Sensitive Self-report Data by Both Consent and Information.” *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 2, 369-374 (1987).

to present no more than minimal risk, many consider it safer not to do so, fearing that such an action might leave them open to question by OHRP. However, researchers, science, institutions, subjects and IRBs would all be better off if they made intelligent interpretation of the requirements of the Common Rule.

The Social and Behavioral Sciences Working Group has made various recommendations based on the Common Rule, designed to guide social and behavioral researchers and IRBs out of such conundrums. The authors, both members of the Working Group, developed recommendations concerning informed consent, some of which are summarized here:

1. Informed consent should take the form of an open, easily understood communication process.⁵ Typically, this means a friendly verbal exchange between researcher and subject, with a written summary of the information for the subject to keep, as appropriate. (The copy for the subject to keep would be inappropriate if the written record of the subject's participation could be damaging to the subject, as when the research is about domestic violence, or illegal behavior). Both the verbal and written discussions should be brief, and simply phrased at such a level that the subjects (or those act on their behalf) can understand them.
2. Subjects must receive enough easily understood, accurate information to judge whether the risk or inconvenience involved is at a level they can accept. The responsibility rests with the investigator to describe any risks accurately and understandably. There are many kinds of minor or everyday risks or inconveniences that most persons would gladly undertake if it were their choice to do so but which they would not wish to have imposed upon them unilaterally. However, some may make a rational decision that the experience would be too stressful, risky or unpleasant for them for some idiosyncratic reason that applies to them and not to other subjects.
3. Especially when the research procedure is long and complex, the researcher must make it quite clear that the subject is free to ask questions at any time. Informed consent, as a conversation (not a form), needs to be available throughout the research, as subjects do not necessarily develop questions or concerns about their participation until they are well into the research experience. For example, a discussion of confidentiality may not capture subjects' attention or comprehension until they are asked some quite personal questions in the ensuing research experience.
4. When subjects can readily refuse to participate by hanging up the phone or tossing out a mailed survey, the informed consent can be extremely brief (a sentence or two). Courtesy and professionalism require that the identity of the researcher and research institution be mentioned, along with the nature and purpose of

⁵ This could take many forms. For example, if conducting a housing study of elderly people at a retirement community, the PI should be mindful of the safety needs of elders, and of possible memory, auditory and visual impairment. They might begin by explaining the purpose of the interviews and answering questions at the community's meeting center. They might arrange to publicize the discussion in the community's newsletter, with photos of the interviewers, to be distributed to all residents. In preparation for the interview, the interviewers might then make initial contact with individual households by phone or letter. Upon arriving, they might bring along the article so that the elderly residents could ascertain that they are admitting bona fide interviewers and not con artists. The interviewers might then provide a brief summary of their purpose, confidentiality and other pertinent elements of consent, obtain the verbal consent of the respondents and proceed.

In other cases, venues such as focus groups, group discussions, or other kinds of gatherings might serve as the most effective way to gain potential subjects' interest and attention, provide details and answer questions. The actual recruitment and consent or declination could occur at a later time after the details have been carefully considered. In still other cases, as among homeless or other wary groups, meeting with informal leaders or gatekeepers of the group can serve as a first step in getting word to potential subjects about the nature and purpose of the research and what it would entail. This might then be followed up with other meetings, and finally with recruitment and individual informed consent or declination.

When the research procedures are lengthy and complex, brochures, videotapes, simulations, and discussion with prior subjects may be effective ways to begin communication with prospective subjects.

the research. However, if there are no risks, benefits or confidentiality issues involved, these topics need not be mentioned, as such details would be gratuitous and might decrease participation by implying greater risk that actually exists. If the researcher has any connection with the institution at which the subjects receive health care or other essential services, it is necessary to mention the right of the research subject to refuse or to withdraw without prejudice. Such rights may be honored implicitly by making it clear that you are asking their permission to involve them as research subjects.

5. Verbal informed consent need not be detailed and written consent is not appropriate when the research is not concerned with sensitive personal information and when subjects are peers or superiors of the researcher

6. The cultural norms and life-styles of subjects should be considered in deciding how to approach informed consent. For example, research on homeless injection drug users should probably be preceded by a several weeklong process of "hanging out" and talking with them. The resulting informal communication will raise issues they wish to discuss with the researcher. The conditions under which the research is conducted can then be negotiated orally between the researcher and the community members, as appropriate. Written documents and signed forms would expose subjects to risk of arrest and serve no redeeming purpose.

7. A wide range of media are appropriate for administering informed consent. Video tapes, brochures, group discussions, web sites, community newsletters, and the "grape vine" can be more appropriate ways of communicating with potential subjects than the kinds of legalistic formal consent forms that often are used.

8. When written or signed consent places subjects at risk, it must be waived. There are times when the written record is the only evidence that the subject has participated in a study in which there is acknowledgement or appearance of situations that would place the subject at risk.

9. When it is important to have some record of the informed consent but when written or signed document would either place the subject at risk or be difficult for the subject to read, it may be useful to have a trusted colleague witness the verbal consent.

10. Community consultation, or meeting with community leaders of the potential subjects, is a useful way to plan research that is likely to raise sensitive questions among those to be studied and members of their community. This is not a substitute for individual informed consent, but often clears the way for potential subjects to be ready to decide whether to participate.⁶

11. In certain circumstances, persons are not in a position to decide whether to consent until immediately after their participation begins, e.g., in brief sidewalk interviews, which persons are likely to welcome.

12. Some research cannot validly be conducted if all details are disclosed at the outset. The alternatives to outright deception of subjects are to (a) obtain permission to provide only a description of what the subject will experience, with an agreement that the full details of the study will be disclosed afterward; (b) obtain permission to engage in concealment or deception with the understanding that pilot research has shown that peers of the subject do not find such concealment or deception objectionable and that a full explanation will follow their participation, or (c) explain that the subject might be enrolled in one of several possible conditions and to gain permission to disclose in which of these the subject was actually enrolled after his or her participation is completed.

⁶ For a description and example of community consultation, see Melton, G., Levine, R. J., Koocher, G., Rosenthal, R., & Thompson, W. (1988). Community Consultation in Socially Sensitive Research: Lessons from Clinical Trials on Treatments for AIDS. *American Psychologist*, 43, 573-581.