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**Common Questions**

**1. Declaration**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 1.1  | I verify that; a) this project has been reviewed and deemed to be methodologically sound and complies with the professional ethical standards and guidelines of the area of research. b) the information contained in this application is accurate; c) that the conduct of the proposed research will not commence until ethical approval/clearance has been granted.  | I agree |
| 1.2  | Please indicate the type of research | Undergraduate Student Research |
| 1.3  | If you checked the undergraduate student research box, please indicate if project is part of an Honours Thesis | Yes |
| 1.4  | If you are an graduate/undergraduate researcher you must include your supervisors name on the Project Team Member tab and confirm here that your supervisor has reviewed this application. | Yes - My supervisor is listed and has reviewed this application |
| 1.5  | What level of coursework does this project relate to? | PSYCH 4990 |

**2. Project Description, Methodology & Procedures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 2.1  | Describe the project including purpose and potential benefits. Please use the minimum of technical language | Content moderators are responsible for screening and monitoring social media content which has been flagged as inappropriate (Roberts, 2020). Importantly, this disturbing content has a detrimental effect on moderators’ well-being and mental health (Steiger et al., 2021). Due to the repetitive exposure to explicit material, moderators are likely to develop various forms of psychopathology (e.g., depression or anxiety) (Steiger et al., 2021). Although there is a lack of scientific research investigating this issue, studies on similar highly stressful occupations have suggested that being indirectly exposed to traumatic content may have detrimental consequences for mental health outcomes. For example, many journalists exposed to graphic user-generated content and 911 telecommunicators reported experiencing symptomology similar to that expressed in people with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Feinstein et al., 2014; Pierce & Lilly, 2012). We are interested in examining how emotion regulation predicts well-being and mental health outcomes (such as stress, anxiety, and burnout) in this unique population. To date, there is no published research investigating emotion regulation in the population of commercial content moderators. Emotion regulation involves attempting to modify how an individual may experience or express emotions, and the type of emotion they experience (Gross, 2015). Effective emotion regulation is critical for mental health. Certain strategies have been classified as adaptive (e.g., cognitive reappraisal, which involves changing one’s interpretation of an event to change one’s emotional state) whereas others are considered maladaptive (e.g., rumination, which involves repetitive negative thinking about past events) for mental health and well-being (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2012). According to Gross’ (2002) Process Model of Emotion Regulation, there are various emotion regulation strategies that intervene at various stages of the emotional response. Our study will focus on cognition-focused strategies, that involve cognitive change, such as rumination, acceptance, cognitive reappraisal, and distraction (Shiota & Kalat 2018). In addition, we shall examine the role that emotion beliefs might play in content moderators’ emotion regulation. Beliefs about emotions (e.g., beliefs that emotions are good or bad, or controllable or uncontrollable) may influence the types of strategies that individuals use, which may in turn affect their well-being and mental health (Ford & Gross, 2019). In our study, we shall examine beliefs about controllability (whether participants believe they have control over their emotions) and usefulness (whether participants believe emotions are useful) and their influence on emotion regulation and well-being. For example, previous research shows that people who believe emotions are uncontrollable are less likely to regulate and are more likely to pick ineffective strategies (Tamir et al., 2007). However, the relationship between emotion beliefs and emotion regulation and mental health has not been examined in the content moderator population. Given their repeated and daily exposure to negative content, these individuals form a unique population in which to study the role of beliefs in emotion regulation and mental health. Overall, this correlational study will provide insight into which emotion regulation strategies may enhance or decrease mental health outcomes in content moderators. This research is critical since there has been a lack of awareness and research focusing on well-being in content moderators whose role is becoming increasingly important for keeping the Internet safe. Ultimately, the proposed study will lead to future research to design effective interventions to enhance well-being in this vulnerable group. References Aldao, A., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2012). When are adaptive strategies most predictive of psychopathology?. Journal of abnormal psychology, 121(1), 276–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023598 Ford, B. Q., & Gross, J. J. (2019). Why Beliefs About Emotion Matter: An Emotion-Regulation Perspective. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 28(1), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418806697 Feinstein, A., Audet, B., & Waknine, E. (2014). Witnessing images of extreme violence: a psychological study of journalists in the newsroom. JRSM Open, 5(8),1-7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2054270414533323 Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion Regulation: Current Status and Future Prospects. Psychological Inquiry, 26(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781 Pierce, H., & Lilly M. M. (2012). Duty-related trauma exposure in 911 telecommunicators: Considering the risk for posttraumatic stress. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 25(2), 211–215. DOI: 10.1002/jts.21687 Roberts, T.S. (2020). Behind the Screen: Contention Moderation in the Shadows of Social Media [eBook edition]. Yale University Press: New Haven. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323120912634 Shiota, M. N., & Kalat, J. W. (2018). Emotion. Oxford University Press (custom edition). Steiger, M., Bharucha, T. J., Venkatagiri, S., Riedl, M. J., & Lease, M. (2021). The psychological well-being of content moderators: The emotional labor of commercial moderation and avenues for improving support. Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 341,1-14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445092 Tamir, M., John, O. P., Srivastava, S., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Implicit theories of emotion: Affective and social outcomes across a major life transition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92, 731–744. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.731 |
| 2.2  | Provide a summary of the methodology and procedures. Please keep your summary short & concise.  | Participants (N = 200) will be recruited from Rebuilding Thoughts, an emotional wellness service offering employees one-to-one and group therapy/coaching. To be considered eligible for this two-part study, participants must be fluent in English, be between the ages of 18 and 55, reside in Canada or the United States, and have been employed as a content moderator for a minimum of three months. Participants will receive compensation for their time in their choice of an Amazon gift card, pre-paid Visa card, or cash via PayPal. Compensation for part one will be $8 and compensation for part two will be $12. Eligible participants will receive an email from Nadia Brown (Managing Partner of Rebuilding Thoughts) that contains a link to complete the study on the Gorilla online experiment platform (see Appendix A). Before beginning the study, participants will read an informed consent form (Appendix B). Then, they will fill out demographic questions regarding age, sex, ethnicity, nationality, gender, and highest education level completed, and the amount of time they have been employed as a content moderator (Appendix C). Using the Gorilla online experiment platform, participants will complete a survey consisting of the following self-report measures. Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ; Garnefski et al., 2001; see appendix D). The CERQ consists of 36 items assessing the use of nine cognition-based emotion regulation strategies (self-blame, acceptance, rumination, positive refocusing, refocus on planning, positive reappraisal, putting into perspective, catastrophizing, and other-blame) (e.g., Examples of items include “I tell myself I shouldn’t be feeling the way I’m feeling” and “I think of something nice instead of what has happened”). Participants will indicate what they generally think, when they think about the negative or unpleasant parts of their work as a content moderator on a 5-point scale (1 = “Almost never,” 5 = “Almost always”). Additionally, five items from the Non-Judgment Scale (adapted from the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire, Bohlmeijer et al., 2011; see appendix E) will be embedded within the CERQ. Emotion Regulation Questionnaire - Expressive suppression (ERQ-suppression; Gross & John, 2003, appendix F). The expressive suppression subscale of the ERQ assesses the habitual tendency to suppress one’s facial expressions of emotion, through four items, each rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (e.g., “When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them”). Up-regulation of positive emotions (Livingstone & Srivastava, 2012, see appendix G). Participants will answer each of 20 items assessing their tendency to up-regulate positive emotions (e.g., “I put myself in a situation I know will make me feel good” and “I take a challenge to the next level”) on a scale from 1 = Almost never, to 5 = Almost always. Emotion Beliefs Questionnaire (EBQ; Becerra et al., 2020; see appendix H). The EBQ is a 16-item questionnaire assessing two categories of emotion beliefs: controllability and usefulness. Participants will rate how much they agree or disagree that each statement is true on a 7-point scale (1 = “Strongly disagree,” 7 = “Strongly agree”). Examples of items include “Once people are experiencing negative emotions, there is nothing they can do about modifying them” and “Negative emotions are harmful.” Flexible Emotion Regulation Scale (FlexER-10, Dorfel et al., in preparation, Appendix I). The FlexER-10 assesses the tendency to modulate emotions flexibly according to the context. The scale consists of 10 items (e.g., “I have the choice between different strategies to change my feelings”) answered on a four-point scale from “I perfectly agree” to “I do not agree at all.” Pearlin Mastery Scale (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; see Appendix J). The Pearlin Mastery Scale consists of 7 items assessing the extent to which individuals believe they have personal control over their lives. Participants will rate each statement on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Examples of items include “I have little control over the things that happen to me” and “I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do”. Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995; see Appendix K). The DASS consists of 21 items assessing three categories of negative emotional states: depression, anxiety, and stress. Participants will rate each statement on a 4-point scale from 0 (did not apply to me at all) to 3 (applied to me very much or most of the time). Examples of items include “I couldn’t seem to experience any positive feeling at all” and “I tended to over-react to situations”. Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti et al., 2010; see appendix L). The OLBI consists of 16 items to measure two core dimensions of burnout: exhaustion and disengagement. Participants will indicate the extent to which they agree with each statement on a 4-point scale (1 = “Strongly agree,” 4 = “Strongly disagree”). Examples of items include “I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well” and “During my work, I often feel emotionally drained”. Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5; Blevins et al., 2015; see appendix M). The PCL-5 is a 20-item questionnaire that assess the symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) based on the criteria in the DSM-5. Participants will indicate how much they have been bothered by each problem in the past month on a 5-point Likert scale (“0” = “Not at all,” “4” = “Extremely”). Examples of items include “Having strong negative feelings such as fear, horror, anger, guilt, or shame?” and “Repeated, disturbing dreams of the stressful experience”. Well-being (Huta, 2013 appendix N). Participants will complete a battery of measures assessing hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (including the Satisfaction with Life Scale, Experience of Meaning, and measures of positive and negative affect). Five items from the Conscientious Responders Scale (CRS; Marjanovic et al., 2014, see appendix O) will be embedded within the questionnaires. Each CRS item instructs participants to select a certain option when completing the item to ensure they are paying attention (for example, (“Choose the first option: “Never” in answering this question”). Participants answering three or more attention checks incorrectly will be excluded from analyses. Lastly, participants will be debriefed (Appendix P). Participants who complete the survey will be followed up via email six months later to complete the same measures again on Gorilla. In addition, in part two, we will ask participants if they are still working as a content moderator and if not, how long it has been since they left that role. They will also be asked if they have accessed any mental health resources (e.g., therapy, support from Rebuilding Thoughts). References Becerra, R., Preece, D. A., & Gross, J. J. (2020). Assessing beliefs about emotions: Development and validation of the Emotion Beliefs Questionnaire. PLOS ONE, 15(4): e0231395. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231395 Blevins, C.A., Weathers, F.W., Davis, M.T., Witte, T.K. & Domino, J.L. (2015). The posttraumatic stress disorder checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5): Development and initial psychometric evaluation. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 28, 489–498. Bohlmeijer, E., ten Klooster, P. M., Fledderus, M., Veehof, M., & Baer, R. (2011). Psychometric Properties of the five-facet mindfulness questionnaire in depressed adults and development of a short form. Assessment, 18(3), 308–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111408231 Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15(3), 209–222. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019408 Dörfel, D., Scheffel, C., Schweikert, T. & Gärtner, A. (in preparation). A new self-report instrument for measuring emotion regulation flexibility. Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & Spinhoven, P. (2001). Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ) [Database record]. APA PsycTests. https://doi.org/10.1037/t03801-000 Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 348-362. Huta, V. (2013). Pursuing eudaimonia versus hedonia: Distinctions, similarities, and relationships. In A. Waterman (Ed.), The best within us: Positive psychology perspectives on eudaimonic functioning (chapter 7, pp. 139-158). APA Books. Livingstone, K. M., & Srivastava, S. (2012). Up-regulating Positive Emotions in Everyday Life: Strategies, Individual Differences, and Associations with Positive Emotion and Well-being. Journal of Research in Personality, 46(5), 504-516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.05.009 Lovibond, S.H. & Lovibond, P.F. (1995). Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales. (2nd. Ed.) Sydney: Psychology Foundation. Marjanovic, Z., Struthers, C. W., Cribbie, R., & Greenglass, E. R. (2014). The Conscientious Responders Scale: A new tool for discriminating between conscientious and random responders. SAGE Open, 4(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014545964 Pearlin, L. I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of health and social behavior, 2-21. |

**3. Risk Assessment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 3.1  | Estimate of Risk: What level of overall risk would you assign to this research project?  | Minimal |
| 3.2  | Physical Risk? | Minimal |
| 3.3  | Psychological/Emotional Risk? | Minimal |
| 3.4  | Social Risks? | Minimal |
| 3.5  | Employment Risks? | Minimal |
| 3.6  | If you answered more than minimal risk to any of the above, please describe potential risks as well as the safeguards or procedures you have in place. Please provide justification for any potential risks involved and explain why alternative approaches (including revising the types of data collected or the method that data is collected) involving less risk cannot be used | N/A |

**4. Participant Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 4.1  | How many participants will take part in total? | We shall recruit 200 participants. |
| 4.2  | Who is being recruited and what is the criteria for the selection? | Content Moderators will be recruited from Rebuilding Thoughts, an emotional wellness service offering employees one to one and group therapy/coaching. Individuals who are aged 18-55 years old, reside in Canada or the United States, and have been employed as a Content Moderator for a minimum of three months will be eligible to take part. |
| 4.3  | Will anyone be excluded from participation? Yes/No; If yes, who and why? | No. |
| 4.4  | How are the participants being recruited? | Nadia Brown (Managing Partner of Rebuilding Thoughts) will email Content Moderators served by her company (she already has access to their email addresses). See recruitment email (appendix A). |

**5. Informed Consent**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 5.1  | Who will consent (check all who apply) | Participant |
| 5.2  | Deception - Will participants be informed of everything that will be required of them prior to the research? Yes/No. If no, please explain.  | Yes, participants will be informed of everything that will be required from them prior to the research study. |
| 5.3  | Are participants to be debriefed at the end of the research project? Yes/No.If yes, explain how it will be done. If not,explain why not. | Yes, participants will be debriefed at the end of the study (see appendix P). |
| 5.4  | Provide a description of the verbal explanation (if any) that will be given to the participants before they are asked to consent to participate (by attachment if required). If not applicable state why. | As described in 4.4, participants will receive a recruitment email (see appendix A) with a link to the study. If they click on the link they will first see the informed consent (see appendix B). |
| 5.5  | To be sensitive to unique situations, including cultural differences, a written consent form may not be appropriate. If there is no consent form explain in detail your alternative procedures to ensure that consent is obtained and recorded as required. | N/A |
| 5.6  | How and when are the participants informed of the right to withdraw? What procedures will be followed for participants who wish to withdraw at any point during the study. Please explain. | As noted on the consent form, participants may withdraw by closing their internet browser at any time during the study (see appendix B). |
| 5.7  | Other Institutions: In the case of projects carried out at other institutions, the Committee requires written proof that agency consent has been received. Please indicate all that apply and provide copies of the consent letters through the attachments tab on this form.  |  |

**6. Project Details**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 6.1  | Where will the project be conducted? | The research will be conducted online on Gorilla. Participants will complete the study from a location of their choice. Gorilla is hosted on Microsoft Azure, with servers in North Europe, within the EU (Republic of Ireland). All traffic to and from Gorilla is encrypted ((TLS/SSL) using industry-standard cryptography. We have used Gorilla in past research in Dr. Ortner's research. |
| 6.2  | Who will actually conduct the study? | Because the research is completed online, none of the researchers will interact with the participants. |
| 6.3  | Will the group of participants have any problems with giving informed consent on their own behalf?  | No |
| 6.4  | If the participants are not competent to give fully informed consent, who will consent on their behalf. What measures will be used to inform and obtain consent on their behalf? | N/A. |
| 6.5  | Are participants considered members of a (potentially) vulnerable group? If yes provide details | No. |
| 6.6  | Does your study have the potential for identifying distressed or disturbed individuals? If yes, provide details. | Although we are including measures to assess mental health and burnout, none of these measures will be used in a diagnostic fashion. In the debriefing, participants will be informed that if they experience any emotional discomfort they may seek support through Rebuilding Thoughts, including a Rebuilding Thoughts app, with meditations and self-guided wellness cards, one-to-one private therapy with a soft cap of two sessions per participant, and a website with information on global mental health resources (including suicide prevention). |
| 6.7  | If your study has the potential to upset participants, or identify distressed or disturbed individuals, you must make arrangements to mitigate such effects. Describe the arrangements you have made.  | As described above, in the debriefing, participants will be informed that if they experience any emotional discomfort they may seek support through Rebuilding Thoughts, including a Rebuilding Thoughts app, with meditations and self-guided wellness cards, one-to-one private therapy with a soft cap of two sessions per participant, and a website with information on global mental health resources (including suicide prevention). |
| 6.8  | What, if any, discomfort or perceived degree of coercion are the particpants likely to endure as a result of the research study? Please explain. | None. |
| 6.9  | What monetary compensation, if any, is being offered to the participants. If none please state so.  | Participants will receive their choice of an Amazon gift card, a Visa card, or cash via PayPal. Compensation for part one will be $8 and compensation for part two will be $12. |
| 6.10  | How much time will a participant need to dedicate to the project? The control group participants? | Participants will need to dedicate approximately 30-35 minutes to complete Part 1, and approximately 30-35 minutes to complete Part 2. |

**7. Data Details**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 7.1  | Who will have access to the data? | The researchers identified in this ethics application will have access to the data, as well as Nadia Brown (Managing Partner at Rebuilding Thoughts). After ensuring that the data are anonymized, data may be shared on an open access repository, such as the Open Science Framework. |
| 7.2  | How will you handle the requirement of confidentiality and anonymity?  | In order to provide participants with their compensation we shall collect email addresses. No other identifying information will be collected. We shall store participant email addresses for three years, to allow for the possibility of follow up for a further research study (See appendix B). Email addresses will not be included in the dataset that will be shared publicly on the Open Science Framework. |
| 7.3  | Will you be using a transcriber? If yes, please provide a copy of a Transcriptionist Confidentiality Agreement with this application. | No |
| 7.4  | What are the specific details of storage and disposal of records/data? (Standard retention timeline is 5 years before disposal)  | All data will be collected online and stored electronically on the researchers' password protected computers. |
| 7.5  | Will any data that identifies individuals be available to persons or agencies outside the Research Group? If yes, provide justification and assessment of risk.  | No. |
| 7.6  | Will your project use (please check all that apply) | Questionnaires (attach copy) |

**8. Additional Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 8.1  | Provide any additional information you may wish to provide in this area. | Thank you for dedicating time to read this ethics proposal. |

**9. Checklists & Good Practices**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| 9.1  | CONSENT: Title of Project - Have you included the title on your consent form? | Yes |
| 9.2  | CONSENT: On your consent form have you included the identification of investigators (including telephone numbers? | Yes |
| 9.3  | CONSENT: On your consent form have you included a brief but complete description (in non technical language) of the purpose of the project and all procedures to be carried out in which the participants are involved | Yes |
| 9.4  | CONSENT: On the consent form have you indicated in some way that the identity of the participant will be kept confidential and a description of how this will be accomplished? | Yes |
| 9.5  | CONSENT: On the consent form have you provided a statement of the total amount of time that will be required of the participant? | Yes |
| 9.6  | CONSENT; On the consent form have you provided details of monetary or other compensation, if any, to be offered to participants? | Yes |
| 9.7  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you offer to answer any inquiries concerning the procedures to ensure that they are fully understood by the participant and to provide a debriefing if appropriate? | Yes |
| 9.8  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a statement of the participants right to withdrawal or refusal to participate will be jeopardize further treatment, medical care or influence class standing as applicable? | Yes |
| 9.9  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a place for signatures of the participant consenting to participate in the research project, investigation or study? | Yes |
| 9.10  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a statement acknowledging receipt of a copy of the consent form including any attachments?  | Yes |
| 9.11  | CONSENT: On Parental Consent forms - Did you provide a statement of choice providing an option for refusal to participate (e.g. "I consent/do not consent to mu child's participation in this study") | Yes |
| 9.12  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide the contact information for the relevant Dean and Chair of the REB? (Chair contact information: TRU-REB@tru.ca or 250.828.5000) | Yes |
| 9.13  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a statement as to what the information will be used for (presentation, publication, etc)? | Yes |
| 9.14  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a statement as to how the participant can receive a copy of executive summary of completed projects and where appropriate, receive updated information during thecourse of the research? | Yes |
| 9.15  | CONSENT: On the consent form did you provide a statement of the likelihood of any discomforts and/or conveniences associated with the participation and known or suspected short or long term risks, and factors which might lead to refusal to participate? | Yes |
| 9.16  | CONSENT: Use this space to provide details on an item in which you indicated N/A regarding the CONSENT FORMS | N/A. |
| 9.17  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you include the title of your project?  | Yes |
| 9.18  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the Questionnaire did you identify the investigator (including phone numbers) | Yes |
| 9.19  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you include a brief summary that indicates the purpose of theproject, including potential presentation and publication if applicable? | Yes |
| 9.20  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you provide a statement as to the benefits to be derived? | Yes |
| 9.21  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you provide a full description of the procedures to be carried out in which the participants are involved? | Yes |
| 9.22  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you provide a statement of the participants right to refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without jeopardizing further treatment, medical care or class standing as application? | Yes |
| 9.23  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you indicate the amount of time that will be required by the participant? | Yes |
| 9.24  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you provide a statement that indicates if the questionnaire is completed it will be assumed that consent has been given? | Yes |
| 9.25  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On the questionnaire did you provide assurance that the identity of the participant will be kept confidential and description of how this will be accomplished? | Yes |
| 9.26  | QUESTIONNAIRE: On any questionnaire that will be circulated by mail did you include a copy of the explanatory letter as well as a copy of the questionnaire with this application?  | Yes |
| 9.27  | QUESTIONNAIRE: Explain any reasons that you may have indicated N/A for any of the above questionnaire items.  | N/A. |

**Attachments**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Doc / Agreement** | **Version Date** | **File Name** | **Description** |
|  |  | provisos - 103272.docx | N/A  |
|  |  | RESPONSE TO PROVISOS.docx | N/A  |
|  |  | REVISED INFORMED CONSENT AND DEMOGRAPHICS\_Version 2.docx | N/A  |
|  |  | TRACK CHANGED INFORMED CONSENT AND DEMOGRAPHICS\_Version 2.docx | N/A  |
| Other Document | 2022/10/31  | Armstrong & Hopper Appendices.4.docx | This document contains the appendices included in this study.  |
| Other Document |  | Study and consent for Prolific.docx | Study information, consent, debriefing - Prolific participants  |