MAGnituDe

Funded by the European Union

[Deliverable 6.2.]

Ethical guidelines for the entire project

Project Title: Migration, Affective Geopolitcs and European Democracy in Times of Military Conflicts
Project Acronym: MAGnituDe
Grant Agreement no: 101178269
Lead Beneficiary: UGOT
Date of Submission: 2025-10-31
Confidentiality Level SEN

Olga Sasunkevich, University of Gothenburg

olga.sasunkevich@gu.se

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101178269 (MAGnituDe).

Executive Summary

The Ethical Guidelines provide a general framework for conducting ethically sound research and for addressing ethical difficulties and dilemmas emerging in MAGnituDe. MAGnituDe examines the consequences of mass displacement caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine for European democracy. The project is primarily based on qualitative methodology (e.g. interviews, focus-group discussions, participant observation). MAGnituDe engages with several groups of research participants including street-level bureaucrats, civil society organisations, Russophone diasporas and forcibly displaced people from Ukraine. The research is conducted in the context of the ongoing military conflict; therefore, MAGnituDe's ethical principles arise from conflict-sensitive and trauma-informed approaches to research with vulnerable groups. The Guidelines seek to provide the ethical framework for:

- preventing (re)traumatision among research participants;
- benefiting research participants through research;
- preventing re)traumatization or vicarious trauma among researchers.

The document starts with discussing general ethical principles for MAGnituDe related to research integrity and research with human subjects. Then thematically specific ethical principles related to ethics of *conflict-sensitive research*, ethics of *trauma-informed research* and ethics of *research with vulnerable groups* are discussed. The document provides some general directions aiming to help researchers to 'translate' ethical principles in the research practice. This section is also supported by Annex 1 providing detailed recommendations on conducting trauma-sensitive interviews.

The section *Procedural Ethics* explains MAGnituDe's approach to the ethics approval procedure agreed upon in the consortium and provides recommendations for obtaining informed consent in an iterative manner. *Digital Ethics* covers research ethics for digital ethnography, ethics of producing project's documentary reflecting on our research process (D1.2.) and the ethical awareness about using generative artificial intelligence for research purposes in MAGnituDe.

The final section *Ethical Helpdesk* explains the purposes, the mandate, and the organization of this advisory and supportive body in MAGnituDe. The Ethical Helpdesk is established to help researchers in the project to navigate a contested ethical terrain emerging from doing the research in a volatile context.

The current version of the Ethical Guidelines is the work-in-progress. The document will be regularly updated to tackle new ethical issues emerging through the research process.

Table of Content

Abbreviations

Project Abbreviations:

HUG	HELP UKRAINE GOTHENBURG -SWEDEN
UPF	UNIVERSIDAD POMPEU FABRA-SPAIN
LSMC	LIETUVOS SOCIALINIU MOKSLU CENTRAS- LITHUANIA
KKNU	V. N. KARAZIN KHARKIV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY-UKRAINE
UEF	ITA-SUOMEN YLIOPISTO-FINLAND
UG	UNIWERSYTET GDANSKI- POLAND
UGR	UNIVERSITAET GREIFSWALD -GERMANY
ZAVOD APIS	ZAVOD ZA AVTORSKO PRODUKCIJO IZOBRAZEVANJE INOVATIVNOST IN SODELOVANJE-SLOVENIA
UGOT	UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG-SWEDEN

Other:

CSA	Conflict-sensitive approach
CSO	Civil Society organisation
EU	European Union
ECCRI	European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity
EEA	External Ethical Advisor
EHD	Ethical Helpdesk
FDP	Forcibly displaced person
GAI	Generative Artificial Intelligence
PTSD	Posttraumatic stress disorder
SLB	Street-level bureaucrat
TIA	Trauma-informed approach
TPD	Temporal Protection Directive
WP	Workpackage

File History

Creation date:	2025-10-30
Version:	Version 1.0.

Introduction

The aim of the Ethical Guidelines is to provide a general framework for conducting ethically sound research and for addressing ethical difficulties and dilemmas emerging in MAGnituDe in the process of collecting qualitative data. Together with Data Management Plan (D6.1.), the Ethical Guidelines (D6.2.) lays foundation for principles and practices of collecting, storing, analysing and publishing data. MAGnituDe conducts mostly qualitative research on mass displacement related to Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine. The research takes place in the context of the ongoing war, and it involves forcibly displaced people (FDPs) from Ukraine for whom the experience of war and mass displacement can be a traumatic experience. Therefore, MAGnituDe's ethical principles and practices are informed by three approaches: 1) the conflict-sensitive approach; 2) the trauma-informed approach; and 3) the ethical approach to research with vulnerable social groups.

Following Guillemin and Gillam (2004), MAGnituDe distinguishes between procedural ethics and "ethics in practice". Procedural ethics cover formal processes in the research such as the process of seeking ethics approvals for conducting research or obtaining informed consent from research participants. "Ethics in practice", or microethics, refer to "day-to-day ethical issues that arise in the doing of research" (Guillemin and Gillam 2004, 264). While the Guidelines attend to both types of ethics, they put more focus on microethics to tackle the gaps in formal ethical procedures described in the scholarly literature (Guillemin and Gillam 2004; Gillam 2013; McCormack et al. 2012; Ratnam and Drozdzewski 2022). The research community is generally positive about formalisation of ethical procedures considering them as important in protecting research participants from unethical interventions and in enhancing trust in research process and research results. Yet, procedural ethics also receive a well-argued critique from researchers in social science and humanities working with qualitative methods. According to this critique, the procedural ethics rarely consider the specificity of qualitative research in "fragile contexts" (Baker et al. 2023) of war and forced displacement, namely that such research is full of unpredictable twists and emerging ethical dilemmas, which researchers, especially doctoral students and early-career scholars are often left alone to deal with (Taylor 2019). The lack of institutional support to scholars working in volatile contexts increases the risk of harming (e.g. (re)traumatizing)) research participants in such projects as well as the risk of burnout or vicarious trauma among researchers. Thus, the Ethical Guidelines provide guidance for:

- Preventing (re)traumatision among research participants.
- Benefiting research participants through research.
- Preventing re)traumatization or vicarious trauma among researchers.

The current document is work-in-progress. It gives an overview of general and thematically specific ethical principles for MAGnituDe as well as describes MAGnituDe's procedural ethics. The Ethical Guidelines will be regularly updated to reflect on ethical dilemmas and challenges

emerging during project's implementation. The final version of the Ethical Guidelines will be uploaded at the final stage of the project.

Ethical principles in MAGnituDe

General principles

In accordance with the Grant Agreement, MAGnituDe follows the ethical principles of research **integrity** established by the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ECCRI, ALLEA 2023). According to ECCRI, research integrity is based on four principles (cited from ALLEA 2023, 5):

- ***Reliability*** in ensuring the quality of research, reflected in the design, methodology, analysis, and use of resources;
- ***Honesty*** in developing, undertaking, reviewing, reporting, and communicating research in a transparent, fair, full, and unbiased way;
- ***Respect*** for colleagues, research participants, research subjects, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage, and the environment;
- ***Accountability*** for the research from idea to publication, for its management and organisation, for training, supervision, and mentoring, and for its wider societal impacts.

These principles are supported by the ethical requirements for doing research with human subjects (WMA 2024, Swedish Research Council 2024):

- ***To do good (beneficence):*** to make sure that research benefits research participants and a broader society;
- ***To do no harm (non-maleficence):*** given that the benefits outweigh the risks, to make sure that risks are minimised as much as possible;
- ***To respect autonomy***: to respect the right for voluntary participation in research and the right to withdraw the informed consent;
- ***To uphold justice***: to ensure that groups and persons who carry the risk of research also benefit from it; that research contributes to cultivating social, economic, or political justice.

MAGnituDe explores the consequences of mass migration caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine for European democracy. There are four groups of research participants that MAGnituDe involves: 1) street-level bureaucrats (SLBs) – civil servants who have direct contact with migrants; 2) employees and volunteers in migrant-oriented civil society organisations (CSOs); 3) Russophone

diaspora in Germany, Finland, and Lithuania, and 4) FDPs from Ukraine. We apply general ethical principles of research integrity to Groups 1-3 since we assess that their risks from participating in the project are minimal. We, however, assess that the risk for Group 4 is "more than low" (Ratnam and Drozdewski 2022) due to potential (re)traumatisation. For this group we calibrate general principles in line with three approaches, which are most relevant for MAGnituDe's ethical principles and practices: 1) the conflict-sensitive approach; 2) the trauma-informed approach; and 3) the ethical approach to research with vulnerable social groups.

Ethical principles related to MAGnituDe's thematic specificity

Ethics of conflict-sensitive research

The research in MAGnituDe is conducted while Russia's war on Ukraine is ongoing, which requires that MAGnituDe practices the conflict-sensitive approach (CSA). CSA describes the ability of researchers "to understand the context and awareness of researcher's role and positionality within a given context" (Sereda and Mikheieva 2025, 4).

Gabriel and Goetschel (2017, 10) suggest three important steps for practicing CSA:

1) Understanding the context in which one operates.

2) Understanding the interaction between the planned intervention and the context.

3) Acting upon this understanding of the interaction to avoid negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

Understanding the context requires a *good knowledge of the conflict, of the region where it occurs and of societies that it involves*. This knowledge is important for assessing whether research is at all the most needed intervention in this context in a particular moment, given the potentially high burden of such research for both research participants and researchers. If research is assessed as a desirable option, it should be carried in accordance with the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence. The important premise of doing ethical research in a conflict-laden context is that it should bring positive change for communities participating in research.

Understanding the context also demands *attentiveness to terminology and language*. The decision how to name the conflict or how to define social groups involved in research may have important implications for the research process – from the readiness of people to participate in research as informants to the impact on the political decisions related to the conflict (Sereda and Mikheieva 2025).

CSA *also requires constant reflexivity about power relations in the research process*. "Localization of knowledge" (Sereda and Mikheieva 2025, 1), a process of prioritising local experts and voices

(Howlett and Lazarenko 2023), is an important principle for ethical research in times of military conflicts. However, a constant reflexivity about what "local" means in terms of representativeness and intersectionality is an important premise for upholding justice in research (Sasunkevich 2024; Sereda and Mikheieva 2025).

In line with CSA, the following ethical guidelines are suggested for MAGnituDe researchers:

- Keep ourselves constantly updated about the context: the developments in the war, the peace negotiations, the discussions and main conflicts in the Ukrainian society; changes in FDPs status; changes in attitudes towards Ukrainian FDPs in different EU countries.
- Discuss regularly what societal, political and economic changes our research results and communication, disseminations, and exploitation activities contribute to; whom these changes benefit and whom they may potentially harm; whether benefits from our research are based on the principle of justice; how the potential harm can be minimised.
- Use the following terminology to name the conflict *Russian aggression against Ukraine*, *Russian full-scale invasion*, and *the Russo-Ukrainian war* (Sereda and Mikheieva 2025, 6); use FDP to define forcibly displaced Ukrainians, alternatively, use their self-definitions but assess whether self-definitions hold to the principle of justice; consult with CSOs about appropriate language and terminology in their respective national contexts.
- Pursue an intersectional approach to the recruitment of research participants – the cohort should be as diverse as possible in terms of gender, sexuality, age, class, and ethnicity.
- Acknowledge the different proximity to war as well as the different levels of local expertise (national, regional, transnational) within the consortium to make sure that different angles are presented in internal discussions.
- Keep aware that some researchers in the consortium have direct experience of the war and forced displacement, make sure that they are comfortable with the discussions but avoid unnecessary paternalising.

Ethics of trauma-informed research

One of the of ethical challenges for producing research in a war-affected context is "how to talk to people who are traumatized by war or forced displacement" (Sereda and Mikheieva 2025, 8). MAGnituDe addresses this challenge through its SensArticulate methodology (see D1.1. Methods Review on Working with People with Trauma) and the trauma-informed approach (TIA) to ethics.

MAGnituDe acknowledges that "research into mass displacement must take trauma seriously: "not only as a topic of study, but as a force that shapes the ways in which knowledge is produced, shared, and embodied" (Mocnik 2025, 1). MAGnituDe understands trauma as "the sustained

effects of harmful events or experiences widely recognized to include extraordinary events such as disasters, violence and accidents, as well as less 'extraordinary' processes of lives and relationships, including abuse, neglect, betrayal and relational dynamics" (Isobel 2021, 1457; based on SAMHSA 2014). This definition goes beyond the understanding of trauma in medical terms and suggests that trauma is a broad social phenomenon, which is not specific to individuals with known trauma histories (Raja et al. 2015). Therefore, TIA is applicable to a wide range of social research, particularly in fragile contexts such as mass displacement or military conflicts.

Non-medical understanding of trauma considers trauma as subjective experience, rather than a set of objective indicators (Isobel 2021). TIA requires understanding of the diverse nature of traumatic triggers and responses. It acknowledges that traumatising factors can be hard to predict at the outset of the research process (Howe 2022). According to Howe (Ibid, 364), TIA engages with two main questions:

1) How can a researcher reduce the possibility of retraumatizing or causing psychological harm to study participants?

2) How can the possibility of vicarious trauma or retraumatisation be diminished for researchers themselves?

The following ethical principles are suggested to tackle these questions:

- Discuss how trauma is understood and dealt with in the Ukrainian society; what research methods would be most beneficial in terms of preventing retraumatisation (e.g. individual vs collective interviews; in-depth interviews vs art-based sensuous methods).
- Collect information about sources of relevant (e.g. psychological, mental health, community-based) support in each national context as well as online resources to provide for research participants upon request (Howe 2022).
- Develop and follow protocols for trauma-sensitive interviews with FDPs (Annex 1).
- Organise regular (ideally, weekly) debriefs from national research teams where different reactions from research participants are discussed and assessed in terms of potential retraumatisation; the research methods are constantly reassessed and attuned to reduce the possibility of retraumatisation or causing psychological harm to research participants.
- Provide a permanently available ethical support to researchers in the form of the Ethical Helpdesk (see section Ethical Helpdesk) or similar where ethical dilemmas and reflections from the field are discussed.
- Take time to discuss potential retraumatising effects of research with research participants, explain risks carefully, be transparent about the limited resources for assistance in case of psychological harm inflicted by the research process (Howe 2022).
- Respect autonomy of research participants: explain in detail how their data will be used and stored, how they can withdraw from research.

- Uphold justice – plan carefully how limited resources for psychological support available through the project should be prioritised and allocated.
- Organise space for researchers to collectively reflect on their feelings in relation to the research process and to discuss potential challenges and difficulties to prevent professional burnout and vicarious trauma (Baker et al. 2022); meetings should be organised regularly (e.g. on a weekly basis) within workpackages during the active phase of collecting and analysing research data.
- Integrate practices of self-care (Baker et al. 2022) for researchers in project activities, for example, during project meetings or workshops.
- Develop protocols to prevent (re)traumatisation or vicarious trauma among research staff working with data, e.g. project assistants, transcribers, translators (Kiyimba & O'Reilly 2016; Melville & Hincks 2016).

Ethics of research with vulnerable groups

Forcibly displaced people are often considered as a vulnerable social group (Block et al. 2013; Ratnam and Drozdewski 2022). The research with such groups is deemed as research with "more than low" (Ratnam and Drozdewski 2022, 1011) or "considerable" (Wilkinson 2024) risk. In some contexts (e.g. Matos et al. 2022; Wilkinson 2024), the ethical committees prevent researchers from engaging in projects where risks are estimated as considerable imposing many formal protocols and procedures. Researchers argue that this approach is often paternalistic and dismissive of vulnerable groups' agency and ability of decision-making. Coleman (2009, cited in Block et al. 2013, 6) argues that "deeming whole *population*s or *categories* of people as vulnerable lacks sensitivity to context and fails to consider what a person can be vulnerable *to*". This contradicts the general ethical principles of research with human subjects, namely *the respect to autonomy* and *upholding justice.* Such an approach also goes against the general principle of research integrity requiring *respect to research participants*. Moreover, FDPs and other vulnerable groups may see value in contributing to research, especially if they assess that research results are meant to benefit their group interests and help uphold justice (Matos et al. 2023).

MAGnituDe admits that research with forcibly displaced people contains complex ethical challenges arising from a combination of their precarious situation, traumatic experience, and power disparities between researchers and research participants (Block et al. 2013; Hugman et al. 2011; Jacobsen and Landau 2003; Ratnam and Drozdewski 2022). The current anti-migration mobilisation in the EU and elsewhere adds to this complexity (Huizinga et al. 2025). Nonetheless, given the political importance of research interventions in upholding social, economic, and political justice for FDPs, MAGnituDe builds its ethical principles of working with vulnerable

groups on a more nuanced understanding of vulnerabilities. We follow Coleman's (2009) classification where the following types of vulnerability are suggested:

1) Consent-based vulnerability when it is difficult to obtain voluntary and meaningful informed consent.

2) Risk-based vulnerability when research entails physical or psychological risks for research participants.

3) Justice-based vulnerability when research does not benefit research participants and the social group they represent.

MAGnituDe suggests the following ethical principles for research with Ukrainian FDPs:

- Make sure that consent is voluntary: reflect how research participants are recruited; whether there are any dependencies involved in the process; ask participants why they agreed to take part in the project, clarify their understanding of how the research will be used and manage their expectations about the changes it will produce; explain potential risks from participation carefully.

- Ensure that informed consent is meaningful by treating it as a relational process, rather than a one-time event (Howe 2022, 370): return to the question of consent on several occasions – before the start of the research iteration, in the middle and in the end by asking whether participants agree that the story/material they have just shared becomes a research material (see Informed Consent).

- Discuss regularly how research participants can be involved in all stages of the research process – from designing research methods to discussing research results (Mocnik 2025; Baker et al. 2022; Hugman et al. 2011) to maximise the benefits from the research for participants.

- Include MAGnituDe's non-academic partners (Zavod Apis and HUG) in discussions about data collection and data analysis to make use of their expertise in anticipating the risks and increasing the benefits from the research activities for civil society organisations working with FDPs.

- Actively disseminate research results among decision makers and policy implementers to ensure that MAGnituDe contributes to more just politics for Ukrainian FDPs as well as for other groups of refugees and asylum seekers.

Procedural ethics in MAGnituDe

Ethics approval

MAGnituDe's approach to ethics approval relies on previous experience of transnational European projects suggesting that "ethics approval remains a largely national or local phenomenon" (Griffin and Leiberseder 2019, 2). To make the process as smooth as possible and to ensure that partners follow their national and institutional regulations, MAGnituDe decided that each partner conducting research requiring ethics approval would apply for it in accordance with national and institutional rules and procedures established in the contexts where partners operate. MAGnituDe sets a general deadline for obtaining ethics approval – **January 31, 2026** (Month 12 of the project, Milestone 3). UGOT has main responsibility in providing project partners with all necessary documents required for an application for ethics approval.

MAGnituDe requires ethics approval for research involving processing of sensitive personal data in WP2-4. This research includes the following types of data (the full list of data is accessible in Data Management Plan (D6.1., 13-15):

1) Focus-group discussions with SLBs and CSOs (WP2).
2) SensArticulate interviews with FDPs including returnees to Ukraine (WP2, 3).
3) Interviews with service providers in CSOs working with different migrant groups (WP3).
4) Fieldnotes from participant observations in CSOs, workplaces, neighborhoods, educational settings (WP3).
5) Fieldnotes from digital ethnography supported by excerpts from public online forums where different groups of migrants interact (WP3).
6) SensArticulate ethnography including participant observation on memory sites and focus-group discussions (WP4).

Partners involved in collecting data are UGOT, LSMC, KKNU, UEF, UG, UGR. The following table (Table 1) describes in what countries each partner is located, collects and stores data and what permissions are acquired.

Table 1. Ethics approvals in the project

Partner	Country of location	Country of data collection and data storage	Ethics approval

University of Gothenburg (UGOT)	Sweden	Data collection – Sweden and Germany, storage and processing of data – Sweden	Decision nr 2025-04739-01, received 2025-08-19, covers data collection in Sweden, storage and processing of data in Sweden, including data collected in Ukraine
Lithuanian Center for Social Research (LSMC)	Lithuania	Data collection – Latvia and Lithuania, storage and processing of data – Lithuania	Ethics approval AMTEK P-6, received 2025-04-14, covers data collection in Latvia and Lithuania, storage and processing of data in Lithuania
Karazin Kharkiv National University (KKNU)	Ukraine	Data collection – Ukraine and digitally, storage and processing of data – Sweden[1]	Ethics approval SAU_101178269, received 2025-08-21, covers data collection in Ukraine and in a digital space
University of Eastern Finland (UEF)	Finland	Data collection – Finland and Germany, storage and processing of data – Finland	Description No 34/2025 of UEG's Research Ethics Committee states that if research does not involve a risk of causing mental harm that exceeds the limits of normal daily life to the research participants or their

[1] Since KKNU is located close to the frontline, UGOT and KKNU reached an agreement that sensitive personal data collected by KKNU in Ukraine will be safely transferred to secure storage at UGOT. Researchers from KKNU will have access to this storage and will be able to work with their data directly.

			family members or others closest to them the ethics approval is not required in accordance with the Finnish legislation. While our research does entail the risk of retraumatisation, we assess that the risk of mental harm beyond the limits of normal daily life is unlikely in our project.
University of Gdansk (UG)	Poland	Data collection, storage and processing of data – Poland	Ethics approval is pending
University of Greifswald (UGR)	Germany	Data collection, storage and processing of data – Germany	Ethics approval is pending

Informed consent

Another important aspect of procedural ethics is informed consent. Obtaining informed consent guarantees that MAGnituDe follows the principles of respect for research participants and their autonomy and that research participants decide independently and voluntarily to engage in research. Scholars working within conflict-sensitive and trauma-informed traditions and doing research on vulnerable groups dedicate special attention to the issue of informed consent. Sereda and Mikheieva (2025, 14) consider the mere act of receiving informed consent in a written form (a signed document) or verbally as insufficient under wartime conditions because project participants (as well as researchers themselves) can be unaware of all potential risks. They suggest that informed consent can be obtained only after benefits and risks of participation are thoroughly discussed with research participants. To add to this, in some contexts, a signed form of consent where a real name of a research participant is stated can put people at risk rather than

protect them. In Sweden, for instance, research documentation, including consent forms, has a status of public document which means that hypothetically researchers can find themselves in a situation where they are requested to disclose the names of their research participants by state authorities. In this sense, the consent form serves researchers and universities more than it serves research participants (on a similar critique see Ellis et al. 2007).

Researchers working with vulnerable groups in volatile contexts (Block et al. 2013; Howe 2022; Mackenzie et al. 2007) suggest that acquiring informed consent should be an iterative process, rather than a one-time event. Acknowledging content-based vulnerability (Coleman 2009) of refugees and FDPs, it is argued that research participants can consent meaningfully only after they and researchers achieve "a shared understanding of what is involved at all stages of the research process" (Mackenzie et al. 2007: 307). It means that in some cases a meaningful research consent is impossible to achieve before the research process of sharing personal experiences with researchers begins.

MAGnituDe applies different approaches of acquiring informed consent depending on the group of research participants. We suggest that in the case of SLBs, CSOs, and Russophone diaspora, the standard procedure of obtaining the consent is followed. In the case of Ukrainian FDPs we suggest an extended procedure.

Standard procedure of obtaining informed consent (for SLBs, CSOs, and Russophone diaspora)

- Send information for research participants based on the template provided in Annex 2. Translate information in the local language. Insert information that is relevant and specific for your context.
- Before starting research iteration (focus group, interview or participant observation), discuss the project, the method, the risks, the processing and storage of data with research participants; clarify participants' understanding of how the research will be used and manage their expectations about the changes it will produce. Use the following questions as a guidance:
    - Did a participant read information in advance?
    - If not, do they want to read it or do they prefer that you summarise information for them?
    - Do they have any questions? Is there something unclear about any aspects of a research process?
    - Do they understand how their data will be stored and processed?
    - Do they understand that their data will be pseudonimised but that the full anonymity cannot be guaranteed?
    - Do they understand that their participation is voluntarily and they can withdraw from research any time and without any consequences up until the moment

when research results are used for the analysis to produce project-related publications including popular science interventions?

- Do they understand that they are free to choose what questions to answer and how much of their personal story/reflections they want to share?
- Do they understand how research results will be used and what change they intend to produce?
- Do they agree to sign a consent form?

➢ Ask participants to sign a consent form. In case of focus-group discussions, each participant signs the form individually.

Extended procedure of obtaining informed consent (for FDPs)

This procedure requires that researchers obtain consent before, during and after research iteration (see Block et al. 2013).

➢ Send information for research participants based on the template provided in Annex 2. Insert information that is relevant and specific for your context.

Before interview:

➢ Ask participants whether they received and read project information. Suggest taking time to go through information together. Pay attention to questions of data processing and storage, underline that data will be pseudonimised but *not* anonymised.

➢ Discuss interview themes/questions. Ask what themes they consider as most sensitive or uncomfortable.

➢ Discuss risks. Present the risk of (re)traumatisation identified by the project. Ask them what other possible risks they see in sharing their story.

➢ Explain the interview process. Underline that there are no right and wrong answers but that participants themselves choose how to tell their story and what parts of it to share with researchers.

➢ Discuss why participants agreed to take part in the project. Explain that we need to make sure that they participate voluntarily. Underline the right to withdraw from research, including during the interview, up until the moment when research results are used for the analysis to produce project-related publications including popular science interventions.

➢ Obtain **oral** consent to conduct research and record/document research material.

During interview

- Consider, when appropriate, warning research participants if the forthcoming questions or topics can be considered as sensitive and potentially disturbing to make sure that they agree to discuss them.
- Pay attention to participants' non-verbal behaviour, in particular, signs of fatigue or reluctance to speak. Remind participants, if appropriate, that they can stop the research iteration at any moment or can skip questions that they consider particularly disturbing.

After interview

- Ask participants how they feel about their story – do they agree that it is included in the research material and becomes available to more people (other researchers, other team members, even if in a pseudonymised form)? If a participant raises reservations or doubts in relation to some aspects of their story, discuss a possibility to send and verify an interview transcript before it is used in the analysis. Document this in the logbook for interviews with FDPs.
- Ask participants whether they could consider signing a consent form. Instruct them that they are not obliged to reveal their real name, neither do they have to leave their signature since that the requirement to sign a written consent can be sensitive for Ukrainian FDPs. If participants do not want to sign the form, make a note in the logbook that the consent was obtained orally.
- If a research iteration includes collection of other types of data (e.g. collages, drawings), ask participants' consent to ensure that this material can be used in analysis. Document this in the form.

Digital Ethics

Research in social networks

MAGnituDe plans to collect data in social networks through digital ethnography (WP3, Task 3.4,). Researchers responsible for collecting digital data are recommended to follow the Ethical Guidelines of the Association of Internet Researchers (franzke et al. 2019). The research takes place in forums and social network groups for migrants residing in Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden. Although people's posts and comments in such groups can be considered as semi-public data in legal terms, they may be perceived by users themselves as a highly private matter (franzke et al. 2019, 10). Therefore, the storage, processing, analysis and use of these data should be based on the same approach that MAGnituDe applies to other types of personal sensitive data (Sandberg 2022). In particular, researchers are requested to:

- Store this type of digital data in the same secure storage as other types of sensitive personal data (see D61.1. Data Management Plan, 11-12).
- Pseudonymise these data and apply the same rules of secure storage and codification as in relation to other types of sensitive personal data (Ibid).
- Ensure that the quotes from the data used for research publications cannot be traced to the online sphere. As a principal, direct quotes and reformulated quotes with information that can be traced to a particular user should be avoided unless absolutely necessary. In the latter case, the researchers should seek to obtain informed consent from users-authors of the quotes.
- If data are collected from open forums and social media groups, informed consent is not required. However, as stated, if direct quotes from particular users are used and these users are traceable, informed consent should be obtained.
- If data are collected from closed forums and social media groups requiring prior registration, researchers should inform the group admins about their intention and discuss with them the best way to inform other users about ongoing research. Informed consent from group admins is the minimum requirement allowing researchers to collect data in such settings.

Video material

MAGnituDe plans to collect video-based sensitive personal data with research participants for creating a research-based documentary summarising fieldwork experience (D1.2.). The special protocol for collecting, storing and using such data as well as for obtaining informed consent will be created in a dialogue with EHD at a later stage.

Use of generative artificial intelligence (GAI)

MAGnituDe follows European Commission's Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research (European Commission 2025). MAGnituDe researchers are expected to practice a critical and responsible approach to GAI that takes into account GAI's commercial nature as well as its limitations such as bias, hallucinations and inaccuracies (European Commission 2025, 7). If researchers use AI for generating any type of content including content for communication, dissemination and exploitation activities, this should be always explicitly stated (e.g. in a footnote or in any other appropriate format). Researchers should be particularly careful while using GAI in their work with personal sensitive data, for example, for transcribing interviews. Only AI-tools approved by partner universities and compliant with General Data Protection Regulations can be used for this purpose. Partners are also advised against using AI while working with original and unpublished research results from the project "unless there are assurances that the data will not be re-used, e.g., to train future language models or to the untraceable and unverifiable reuse of data" (European Commission 2025, 8).

The Ethical Helpdesk

The Ethical Helpdesk (EHD) is an advisory and supportive body with a horizontal structure. Its mandate is to provide recommendations to researchers and help them in difficult or contested situations.

MAGnituDe establishes EHD with three main purposes:

- To provide continuous ethical support to researchers in the project.
- To act timely in crisis situations related to ethics (e.g. causing significant harm to research participants; conflicts between research participants and researchers; mental distress of researchers; threats to researchers).
- To develop and adjust research protocols and methods to ensure their compatibility with the established ethical principles and their relevance for the research process.

The structure of EHD

Regular members:

Olga Sasunkevich, Project PI, main contact point

Nena Močnik, WP Lead for WP1.

Oksana Shmulyar Green, WP Lead for WP2.

Vilana Pilinkaitė-Sotirovič, WP Co-Lead for WP3.

Olga Davydova-Minguet, WP Lead for WP4.

External Ethical Advisor:

Jenny Phillimore, Professor of Migration and Superdiversity, Birmingham University

Organisation of work

EHD organises regular meetings where researchers can reflect on their research experiences and ethical dilemmas emerging from the field. EHD can also meet more often upon request from researchers.

EHD also ensures that the space for regular debriefings is organised during the active phase of collecting and analysing data involving Ukrainian FDPs. The regular members of EHD involved in WP 2-4 where the collection of such data takes place make sure that weekly or bi-weekly debrifings are taking place within respective WPs. If the data collection in several WPs overlaps, the option of joint debriefing can be considered.

EHD develops and implements a rapid response protocol for crisis situations related to the ethics of the research process in MAGnituDe.

Regular members are responsible for keeping contact with External Ethical Advisor (EEA) and for discussing with EEA complex or ambiguous ethical issues in the project on behalf of MAGnituDe's researchers. EEA can be invited to selected meetings of EHD.

How to contact EHD

The main contact point for EHD is project PI Olga Sasunkevich (olga.sasunkevich@gu.se). However, researchers in the project are free to contact any other regular member whom they trust and need expertise from.

EHD should follow **the principle of confidentiality** – the names of researchers contacting EHD should be kept confidential unless a researcher themselves wants to discuss their dilemmas further with other members of the consortium.

The composition of EHD can change over time to reflect researchers' needs or emerging ethical dilemmas.

Psychological support in MAGnituDe

The project allocates limited resources for providing psychological support to research participants or researchers in crisis situations. The rules for using these resources should be established and agreed upon during the first EHD meeting and be included in a rapid response protocol.

References

ALLEA (2023) *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* – Revised Edition 2023. Berlin. DOI 10.26356/ECOC.

Baker, S., Bellemore, P., & Morgan, S. (2023). Researching in fragile contexts: Exploring and responding to layered responsibility for researcher care. Women's Studies International Forum, 98, 102700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2023.102700

Block, K., Warr, D., Gibbs, L., & Riggs, E. (2013). Addressing Ethical and Methodological Challenges in Research with Refugee-background Young People: Reflections from the Field. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *26*(1), 69–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fes002

Coleman, C. H. (2009). Vulnerability as a regulatory category in human subject research. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics: A Journal of the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, *37*(1), 12–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-720X.2009.00346.x

Draucker, C. B., Martsolf, D. S., & Poole, C. (2009). Developing distress protocols for research on sensitive topics. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, *23*(5), 343–350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2008.10.008

Ellis, B. H., Kia-Keating, M., Yusuf, S. A., Lincoln, A., & Nur, A. (2007). Ethical research in refugee communities and the use of community participatory methods. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *44*(3), 459–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461507081642

European Commission. (2025). *Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research*. https://european-research-area.ec.europa.eu/news/living-guidelines-responsible-use-generative-ai-research-published

franzke, a.s., Bechmann, A.,, Zimmer, M., Ess, C. and the Association of Internet Researchers (2020). *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0.* https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf

Gabriel, S., & Goetschel, L. (2017). *A Conflict Sensitive Approach to Field Research – Doing Any Better?* Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.848501

Gillam, L. (2013). Ethical Considerations in Refugee Research: What Guidance Do Formal Research Ethics Documents Offer? In K. Block, E. Riggs, & N. Haslam (Eds), *Values and vulnerabilities: The ethics of research with refugees and asylum seekers* (First edition., pp. 21–39). Australian Academic Press.

Griffin, G., & Leibetseder, D. (2019). "Only Applies to Research Conducted in Sweden…": Dilemmas in Gaining Ethics Approval in Transnational Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *18*, 1609406919869444. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919869444

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(2), 261–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403262360

Howe, K. (2022). Trauma to self and other: Reflections on field research and conflict. *Security Dialogue*, *53*(4), 363–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/09670106221105710

Howlett, M., & Lazarenko, V. (2023). How and when should we (not) speak?: Ethical knowledge production about the Russia–Ukraine war. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, *26*(4), 722–732. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-023-00305-2

Hugman, R., Pittaway, E., & Bartolomei, L. (2011). When 'Do No Harm' Is Not Enough: The Ethics of Research with Refugees and Other Vulnerable Groups. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *41*(7), 1271–1287. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr013

Huizinga, R. P., Hopkins, P., Benwell, M. C., De Backer, M., Finlay, R., Hörschelmann, K., Kirndörfer, E., & van Liempt, I. (2025). Ethical and Methodological Considerations in Research with Asylum-Seeking and Refugee Youth in European Cities. *Social Sciences*, *14*(4), 204. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14040204

Isobel, S. (2021). Trauma-informed qualitative research: Some methodological and practical considerations. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, *30*(S1), 1456–1469. https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12914

Jacobsen, K., & Landau, L. B. (2003). The dual imperative in refugee research: Some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration. *Disasters*, *27*(3), 185–206. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7717.00228

Kiyimba, N., & O'Reilly, M. (2016). An exploration of the possibility for secondary traumatic stress among transcriptionists: A grounded theory approach. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *13*(1), 92–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2015.1106630

Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C., & Pittaway, E. (2007). Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Refugee Research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *20*(2), 299–319. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem008

Matos, L., Indart, M. J., Park, C. L., & Leal, I. (2023). "I'm Going to Tell You Something I Never Told Anyone": Ethics- and Trauma-Informed Challenges of Implementing a Research Protocol with Syrian Refugees. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(2), 1261. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20021261

Melville, A., & Hincks, D. (2016, May). Conducting Sensitive Interviews: A Review of Reflections. *Law and Method*. https://doi.org/10.5553/REM/.000015

McCormack, D., Carr, T., McCloskey, R., Keeping-Burke, L., Furlong, K. E., & Doucet, S. (2012). Getting through ethics: The fit between research ethics board assessments and qualitative research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics: JERHRE*, *7*(5), 30–36. https://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2012.7.5.30

Mocnik, N. (2025). *Methods Review on Working with People with Trauma*. Unpublished.

Raja, S., Hasnain, M., Hoersch, M., Gove-Yin, S., & Rajagopalan, C. (2015). Trauma informed care in medicine: Current knowledge and future research directions. *Family & Community Health*, *38*(3), 216–226. https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0000000000000071

Ratnam, C., & and Drozdzewski, D. (2022). Research ethics with vulnerable groups: Ethics in practice and procedure. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *29*(7), 1009–1030. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2021.1994932

SAMHSA. (2014). *SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach* (HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884). Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. https://ncsacw.samhsa.gov/userfiles/files/SAMHSA_Trauma.pdf

Sandberg, M., Rossi, L., Galis, V., & Bak Jørgensen, M. (Eds). (2022). *Research Methodologies and Ethical Challenges in Digital Migration Studies: Caring For (Big) Data?* Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81226-3

Sasunkevich, O. (2024). Affective Dialogue: Building Transnational Feminist Solidarity in Times of War. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *49*(2), 361–384. https://doi.org/10.1086/726637

Sereda, V., & Mikheieva, O. (2025). How (Not) to Study a War-Affected Society: Challenges of Knowledge Production in Ukraine and Elsewhere. *Nationalities Papers*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.56

Swedish Research Council. (2024). *Good Research Practice 2024* (Text No. 5.2-2022–06129). https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2025-07-03-good-research-practice-2024.html

Taylor, S. (2019). The long shadows cast by the field: Violence, trauma, and the ethnographic researcher. *Fennia - International Journal of Geography*, *197*(2), 183–199. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.84792

Thompson, B. (1995). Ethical dimensions in trauma research. *The American Sociologist*, *26*(2), 54–69. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02692027

Vickers, E. L. (2019). Unexpected Trauma in Oral Interviewing. *The Oral History Review*, *46*(1), 134–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/ohr/ohy099

Wilkinson, L. (2024, November 5). What Research Ethics Boards know and don't know about research with refugee populations [IMISCOE]. *Methodological Approaches and Tools in Migration Research Blog*. https://www.imiscoe.org/news-and-blog/sc-blogs/meth-mig/2230-what-research-ethics-boards-know-and-dont-know-about-research-with-refugee-populations

The World Medical Association. (n.d). WMA Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants. Retrieved October 3, 2025, from https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki/

Annexes

Annex 1. Protocol for trauma-informed interviewing with FDPs

The aim of this protocol is to provide guidance for trauma-informed interviewing. The situations of distress in the research process are largely managed "in the moment" (Isobel 2021, 1462; Vickers 2019). The protocol is needed to make sure that researchers are prepared to make circumstantial decisions under the distressful research process. The protocol covers the following aspects of the research process: 1) recruitment of research participants; 2) preparation for interview; 3) before interview; 4) during interview; 5) after interview; 6) how to deal with unexpected findings.

1. Recruitment of research participants

MAGnituDe strives for a diversity of perspectives on mass displacement and encourages researchers to use the principle of *intersectionality* in recruiting research participants (see Ethics of conflict-sensitive research).

The following criteria should be used to select research participants:

1) Research participants have a temporal protection status in accordance with the Temporal Protection Directive.
2) Research participants are minimum 18 years old.
3) The group of research participants is as diverse as possible in terms of their family status, gender, age, educational level, professional status, previous migration experience, ethnicity.

Participants with the signs of deep traumatisation should be advised against participating in research. This can be, however, difficult for researchers to assess. Individuals with known history of diagnosed posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) have a higher risk of being harmed during the interview. If a researcher doubts whether a research participant should participate in the interview, the following screening protocol can be used (adopted from Draucker et al. 2009, 347):

Because the topic of our research can be sensitive and may cause (re)traumatisation, we are advising individuals who are experiencing a high level of stress or emotional distress not participate at this time. Can I ask you some questions related to this?

Screening Questions	No	Yes	Follow-up questions If yes, ask questions	Yes	No

Are you experiencing a high level of stress or any emotional distress?			Tell me what you are experiencing. Is it getting in the way of doing things you need to do (school, work, family obligations)? Is it getting in the way of you taking care of yourself? Have you been in the hospital recently for this problem?		

If answers are “No”, you can consider a research participant for an interview.

If answers are “Yes” and “No”, consult with the Ethical Helpdesk.

If answers are “Yes”, advice a research participant against participating in the research and, if needed, provide with relevant information about psychological support.

2. Preparation for interview

Place for interview

Allow participants to choose the place for an interview unless an interview requires the usage of special materials and techniques to implement SensArticulate methods. While choosing the place, the comfort of research participants but also the safety of researchers should be taken into consideration. Online interviews can be sometimes preferable by research participants who may feel more in control of the situation while connecting from their place of comfort. However, online interviews can be less suitable for SensArticulate interviews developed in MAGnituDe. When conducting interviews or other types of research meetings with participants in real life, advise a colleague, a friend or a family member when and where the meeting takes place and inform them when the meeting is finished.

Information for research participants

Provide research participants with information about the project and the research process before you agree to meet. It is also advisable to send the list of preliminary topics and questions in advance to ensure that research participants know what will be discussed during the interview and can make an informed decision.

Time for interview

Plan sufficient time for interview. Be aware that interviews about traumatic experiences can last longer. Try to schedule no less than 3 hours per interview and no more than one-two interviews per day per researcher to make sure that each participant has enough time to tell their story and that researchers have time to rework and recover after each interview.

3. Before interview

- For trauma-informed interviews follow the extended procedure of obtaining informed consent.
- While discussing risks with research participants, keep in mind that excessively "warning people about risks that are unlikely to occur" (Isobel 2021, 1462) may cause more harm than the interview itself.
- Underline the power of research participants in the process – they can choose what aspects of their experience to talk about, what questions to refuse and how to develop their story. Discuss topics and questions that they think may be too sensitive and distressing to make sure that you signal when these questions occur in the interview. Clarify participants' expectations from the interview and explain carefully whether and how they can be met.
- Inform research participants that the project can offer emergency psychological support and provide information about available psychological resources offline and online.

4. During interview

- Announce, if possible, when you want to raise a sensitive question or a potentially distressing topic. Respect participant's choice to tell their story in their own way including their right to avoid some of the topics.
- If the story develops too quickly and becomes too distressful for both a research participant and a researcher, use the brake (Howe 2022, 371) – slow down the interview, shift the focus to other, more neutral topics. Use SensArticulate methods and techniques (collage, photovoice, etc.) to get slowly into participant's experience and story.
- Be attentive to participant's non-verbal reactions and behaviour during the interview process: are participant's reactions normal or disturbing?
- If participants react too emotionally by starting to cry or to tremble or by keeping long silent breaks, consider the following steps:
    - acknowledge that you have noticed a change in their behaviour, unless the change is too obvious, ask them how they feel at the moment and whether they want/are ready to continue;

- pause and keep silent: calm presence can be more supportive than immediate verbal comfort, you should avoid offering an immediate answer and intervention, just wait, give space and time, but keep present;
- acknowledge emotion by using simple statements such as “I see this is difficult to talk about, take your time”; validate experience but don’t pathologise by making them feel 'victim', or even 'hero', for example, by saying 'you are brave’ or alike;
- give them choice: remind participants that they can pause, skip a question, or stop the interview – this reinforces their feeling of safety, trust and control;
- stay within your role as researcher (as researchers, our goal is compassionate containment, not psychological intervention);
- stop if necessary, but don't flee the interview location;
- after the interview: offer a brief debrief or grounding exercise if you know how to do it (deep breathing, drinking water, or a short walk) and provide referral information if needed.

- Try to be an empathetic listener to all participants, notwithstanding whether you agree or disagree with their opinions or can relate do their experience. Listen attentively and patiently – give participants time to articulate their experiences on their own terms, do not rush to fill uncomfortable silences.
- Be compassionate and patient. If you occasionally share emotions with participants (by starting to cry while listening to participant’s story, for instance), this is a normal reaction which humanises research encounters and is seen as part of relational ethics. However, if your emotional distress reoccurs regularly, you should seek the support from your colleagues and professional help since this may indicate vicarious trauma. Consider informing EHD or other colleagues in the project about this.

5. After interview

- Allow participants to share their unstructured thoughts when the formal part of the interview is over.
- Discuss with research participants their feelings and thoughts about the interview process.
- Discuss whether their experience during the interview influences their decision to take part in the research, ask for the formal written or verbal consent to use their story or other materials from the process in the research.

If a participant or a researcher assesses that the experience during the interview was too distressful:

- Remind a participant that the project can offer emergency psychological support. Ask them whether they want to receive information about other psychological resources available to them in their context or online.
- Ask if it is okay if you follow up on participants' well-being a few days after interview, follow up on them and remind them about available psychological support.
- Contact EHD to share what happens during the research process.

For researchers:

- Try to find time to reflect on the research process and your own feelings during the research. Researchers are recommended to keep diaries with their reflections which can be eventually used for writing a reflexive paper or a book chapter for WP1.
- Practice self-care – use practices and techniques of relaxation and stress decrease that work for you personally.
- Take part in research debriefings organised in the project to share and discuss your experience with colleagues.
- Contact EHD or other colleagues for individual advice if you experience too much distress during the research process.

6. How to deal with unexpected findings

We assume that several unexpected findings can appear in research with FDPs. Since many of research participants share a traumatic experience of forced displacement, they can have different psychological diagnoses such as depression or PTSD. This information is important in the context of MAGnituDe's research and should be carefully treated in the project.

Research participants can also eventually share information about their or their family members' drug and alcohol abuse which is not uncommon among people with PTSD. This information can be potentially harmful for participants' personal integrity and should not be processed in the project. Researchers are encouraged to warn research participants from sharing such personal information in research. This information should be also deleted from interview transcripts as soon as possible.

We also consider plausible that some research participants have experienced sexual violence which often accompanies military conflicts and is well documented in the context of the Russo-Ukrainian war. Unless this information has direct connection to research questions and purposes of the project, it should not be processed and should be deleted from research materials as soon as possible. If researchers come across such stories, the following algorithm should be followed:

- First and foremost, stay in your role, which is s to listen but in a way to ensure that no further harm occurs.
- Listen, but not ask for more details or 'investigative questions'.
- Acknowledge, don't ignore: this is very challenging, because you want to say something like "I am sorry this happened to you", and give them space if they want to continue, but

you also want to return back to your focus and not to hijack the interview and turn into therapy; acknowledge, give time but then attempt to navigate conversation back to the research as smoothly as possible, eventually pause and postpone.

- Offer to provide information about potential services (psychological, medical, legal aid), but again, be careful, so you don't get engaged personally.
- Be attentive to recording: if the testimony continues, you can eventually stop recording.
- Contact EHD to report the incident and discuss it with other researchers in the project.

If a participant discloses having committed a crime:

- Remain neutral, non-judgmental and calm – the most challenging thing here is to regulate body expression (shock, anger, approval).
- It is legitimate to stop the encounter if it goes against your moral values; in some encounters we do not engage if we know the background in advance, so it would be hypocritical to claim that we should stay in the situation because of researcher's 'neutrality', but also don't run away from the spot.
- Same as for the victim: do not provoke further disclosure or ask for details; if disclosure is meaningful for the research, then you continue with questions, but not as an investigation but a way to understand your research problem better.
- Refrain from asking for names, dates, or places that could create legal obligations - it is dangerous to become an accomplice.
- Check the national legislation and institutional policies in your own country; in most EU countries, as a social-science researcher you are not mandated to report past crimes, unless there is an imminent risk of serious harm to self or others.
- If disclosure suggests that someone may be harmed, you must contact relevant authorities immediately, but you should avoid getting involved (or becoming mediator).
- Contact EHD to report the incident and discuss it with other researchers in the project.

Annex 2. Information for research participants2

MAGNITUDE. MIGRATION, AFFECTIVE GEOPOLITICS AND EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY IN TIMES OF MILITARY CONFLICTS

Information to research participants

We would like to invite you to take part in the research project. This document contains information about the project and what participation in this project involves.

What the project is about and why we want you to take part in it

MAGnituDe is a Horizon Europe project supported by the European Commission (Grant Agreement 101178269). It examines the consequences of mass displacement resulting from Russia's invasion of Ukraine for European democracy. Eight European countries collaborate in the project: Germany, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Ukraine. The project collects data and develops policy documents and recommendations aimed at:

- strengthening democratic participation for people who have been forced to flee Ukraine;
- improving their encounters with street-level bureaucrats (SLBs, representatives of the state and civil society who provide institutionalised support to migrants in [give examples of relevant organisations, e.g. Employment Agency, Migration Agency, etc.);
- preventing potential conflicts between forcibly displaced people from Ukraine and other groups of migrants (in particular, from Belarus, Russia and Syria);
- advocating for inclusive and multilayered politics of belonging in European countries hosting Ukrainians.

[**Information for SLBs:** The reason you have been asked to participate in the project is that you work in/as [name of organization or the specificity of work] and meet forcibly displaced persons (FDPs) from Ukraine in your work daily. By participating in this project, you contribute to the deeper understanding of how military conflicts and emotional reactions related to them influence the work of SLBs, the professional group you belong to, and what consequences this can have for encounters with FDPs].

[**Information for FDPs, WP2:** The reason you have been asked to participate is because you have expressed interest and, based on the information you have provided, you meet the project's selection criteria. By participating, you will contribute to a deeper understanding of how people in need of protection from Ukraine experience their encounters and contacts with authorities in [name the country] regarding access to work, housing, and education, and how these encounters

[2] The template should be adjusted to the context and filled in with relevant information.

affect their inclusion in [name the relevant national context] society and their plans for the future].

[**Information for FDPs, WP3:** The reason you have been asked to participate is that you have expressed interest and, based on the information you have provided, you meet the project's selection criteria. By participating, you will contribute to a deeper understanding of how people in need of protection from Ukraine experience their encounters and contacts with other migrants, and how these encounters affect their well-being, democratic participation, and inclusion in [name the relevant national context] society]**.**

[**Information for FDPs, WP4:** The reason you have been asked to participate is that you have expressed interest and, based on the information you have provided, you meet the project's selection criteria. By participating, you will contribute to a deeper understanding of how Ukrainians' experience of the war and mass displacement as well as memory conflicts in host societies influence the sense of belonging, democratic participation and social cohesion in Europe].

[**Information for Russophone diaspora, WP4:** The reason you have been asked to participate is that you have expressed interest and, based on the information you have provided, you meet the project's selection criteria. By participating, you will contribute to a deeper understanding of how the Russia's full-scale invasion impacts a sense of belonging among Russophone diasporas in Europe and what measures can be taken to prevent social antagonisms related to the war in Ukraine in European societies].

The principal investigator for MAGnituDe, i.e. organization responsible for the entire project, is the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The organization responsible for conducting research in [name you country] is [name of your organisation]. The research has been approved by [name the authority responsible for the ethical approval of the project, enter the reference number for the ethical approval].

How research will be conducted

[**Information for SLBs:** If you agree to take part in the project, you will be invited to a focus-group discussion where people with similar work experience and daily encounters with forcibly displaced people from Ukraine also take part. You will participate in a discussion with three-four other people. Researchers will make sure that participants do not know each other personally. You can choose to use a pseudonym instead of a real name when you are introduced to other participants of the discussion. The discussion will be moderated by researcher [provide name of the researcher]. [Name of the researcher] will ask you questions about your professional and personal experience of encountering forcibly displaced people from Ukraine, your own attitude to Russia's full-scale invasion, how you balance between your professional role and your personal feelings in attending to the needs of people displaced by the war and what you think can be improved in your work with people directly affected by the war. The discussion will last approximately 1 hour 30 minutes. Some questions may be experienced as uncomfortable or sensitive. You are free to choose what questions you are ready to answer and how much of your

personal feelings and experience you are ready to share with a researcher and other participants of the discussion. The language of the focus-group discussions is [provide relevant information].

[**Information for FDPs, WP2:** If you agree to take part in the project, you will be invited to an interview with the researcher [provide the name] and/or a research assistant [provide the name if relevant]. If the interview takes place in real life, you can suggest the place for the meeting that you consider most comfortable. There is also a possibility to have an interview online via Zoom or Teams. The format of the interview reminds informal conversation. Researchers will ask you about your experience of fleeing Ukraine, why you chose [name relevant country] as your destination and how you experience [name relevant national context] bureaucracy in such spheres as housing, labour market and education. A particular emphasis is put on your emotions and feelings in encountering different authorities in [name relevant country]. However, you can tell your story in your own way and decide what you want to share with researchers and how. You can omit questions that you consider too intrusive or uncomfortable. Each interview usually lasts 1,5-2,5 hours. You can be also asked to participate in a follow-up interview. You can give an interview in the language (or mixture of languages) you feel most fluent in/comfortable with].

[**Information for FDPs, WP3:** If you agree to take part in the project, you will be invited to an interview with the researcher [provide the name]. If the interview takes place in real life, you can suggest the place for the meeting that you consider most comfortable. There is also a possibility to arrange an interview online via Zoom or Teams. The format of the interview reminds informal conversation. The researcher will ask you about your background and life in Ukraine before the war, your social networks and contacts in Sweden as well as your encounters with other migrants including people from Belarus and Russia whose states ally in the war against Ukraine and people from Syria who also have experience of mass displacement related to the war. A particular emphasis is put on your emotions and feelings in encountering other migrants in Sweden. However, you can tell your story in your own way and decide what you want to share with researchers and how. You can omit questions that you consider too intrusive or uncomfortable. Each interview usually lasts 1,5-2,5 hours. You can be also asked to participate in a follow-up interview. You can give an interview in the language (or mixture of languages) you feel most fluent in].

[**Information for FDPs and Russophone diaspora, WP4:** If you agree to take part in the project, you will be invited to visit a memory site [name of the site] in a group of 6-8 other FDPs [alternatively: members of the Russophone diaspora]. After that, you will participate in a group discussion where your reflections about the visit to the memory site, your feelings during this visit, your understanding of [name the national context] historical context and how it influences [name the national context] society's position in relation to Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine will be discussed. A particular emphasis is put on your emotions and feelings. However, you can tell your story in your own way and decide what you want to share with researchers and other participants and how. You can omit questions that you consider too intrusive or uncomfortable. Each discussion will last 1,5-2 hours. Your trip to the memory site will be compensated from the project. You will be also provided with snacks or lunch].

Possible consequences and risks from participation in the project

[**Information to SLBs:** Your participation in this project does not entail any direct risks. You may consider some questions as too personal and, therefore, uncomfortable, however, you are free to refuse to answer them].

[**Information to FDPs:** Some research questions may bring up unpleasant memories and feelings. Participation in the research is voluntary, and you have the right to stop the conversation at any time. You also have the right to change your story and avoid describing the most sensitive or traumatic experiences. The project can offer you psychological assessment if you feel that the interview was too stressful for your well-being. You will also be contacted by the researcher in charge a few days after the interview to follow up on your mental and emotional state. In addition, we can provide information on how to seek counseling through a health center, volunteer organisations or online].

[**Information to Russophone diaspora:** Your participation in this project does not entail any direct risks. You may consider some questions as too personal and, therefore, uncomfortable, however, you are free to refuse to answer them].

What happens to your personal data

The project will collect and record information about you. The following data will be collected and processed within the project: your name, gender, native language, ethnic/national origin, political, philosophical, and religious beliefs. This information will be collected through a consent form where your name will be stated, an information table that you will be asked to fill in, and through a focus group discussion/interview. The transcription of a focus group discussion/interview will be stored separately from the consent form. Your personal data will be coded (pseudonymised), which means that it cannot be directly linked to you as a person. Note that the project cannot guarantee the full anonimisation of your data. [Describe the procedure of storing the code key established at your organization, state who will have access to the original data, see example for Gothenburg: The code key is stored in a secure IT environment at the University of Gothenburg, which is used to store, collaborate, process, and share data with a high level of protection. The code keys will be stored separately from other materials in a folder with its own keyword. Only project researchers at the University of Gothenburg will have access to them].

When the project is completed, the data will be archived and stored for at least 17 years. Archived documents will be protected against destruction, damage, misappropriation, and unauthorised access.

[Name your organisation] is responsible for your personal data and can be contacted via [state the relevant contact of a person/entity responsible for data in your organisation]. According to the EU's General Data Protection Regulation, you have the right to access the data about you that is processed in the project free of charge and, if necessary, have any errors corrected. You can also request that information about you be deleted and that the processing of your personal data be restricted. However, the right to erasure and restriction of processing of personal data does

not apply when research based on your data is published. If you wish to access the data, please contact the responsible researcher [provide relevant name, email and phone number]. If you are dissatisfied with how your personal data is being processed, you have the right to lodge a complaint with [provide the name of the relevant national authority, in the case of Sweden it is the Swedish Data Protection Authority], which is the supervisory authority.

Your data may only be used in the manner to which you have consented. However, [name of your organisation] would like to inform you that there is a possibility that your data may be used in research that has not yet been planned. In such cases, [name the authority responsible for the ethical approval in your context] will decide whether you should be asked for additional consent.

How you receive information about the project results

The results will be published as scientific and popular science texts, such as articles in national and international scientific journals and reports, and presented at scientific conferences, workshops, and seminars, as well as in more popular formats, including art-based representations. If you would like to access the interview material from your own interview, please contact the researcher responsible [name, email].

Insurance and compensation

No special insurance coverage applies to participation in the project, and no special compensation is included.

Participation is voluntary

Your participation is voluntary. You can withdraw from the research at any moment without providing any reasons. Your withdrawal will not have any consequences for you. Please note that if your data have been already used for publication of research results, they cannot be withdrawn.

If you don't want to continue participating in the research, please, contact the responsible researcher (see information below).

Responsible for the project

[Provide name, institutional affiliation, address, email and phone number for responsible researchers in your organisation]

Principal Investigator is Olga Sasunkevich, Department of Cultural Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Box 200 405 30 GÖTEBORG, olga.sasunkevich@gu.se, +46 316 184 083

Annex 3. Consent form3

Consent to participate in the project MAGnituDe. Migration, Affective Geopolitics and European Democracy in Times of Military Conflicts

- I have received oral and/or written information about the project and I have had a possibility to ask my questions. I get to keep the written information.
- I consent to participate in the project MAGnituDe. Migration, Affective Geopolitics and European Democracy in Times of Military Conflicts.
- I consent that my personal data are stored in accordance with the procedure described in the information about the prokect.

Plats och date	Signature
	First and Last Name

[3] Partners can use consent forms from their respective contexts.