2022B0306: Agreement within Romantic Relationships

Final Rule (For office use only)

Study 2022B0306 - Identification

Title of Study*	Agreement within Romantic Relationships
Principal Investigator*	Jason Coronel (coronel.4)
Study Department*	Arts and Sciences | School of Communication (CC12404)
Department Signer	Kelly Garrett (Signed: 09/05/2022)

Principal Investigator - Jason Coronel

Contact Information

Email: coronel.4@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Associate Professor (9M) (2320-9M)
Arts and Sciences | School of Communication (cc12404)
Arts and Sciences (Arts_and_Sciences_CCH6)
100% FTE

PI Eligibility

✓ Eligible

Type of Research

Select the appropriate option below based on the type of review required for the research.

Exempt research: This option should be selected for research that involves human subjects that is not subject to regulations requiring IRB review and approval. Final determination is made by ORRP staff.

Expedited or full IRB-reviewed research: This option should be selected for review by the Biomedical Sciences, Behavioral and Social Sciences, or Cancer IRBs at Ohio State including research reviewed through either expedited or full board processes. This option should also be selected for any research which will be ceded to another non-Ohio State IRB, such as WCG IRB, NCI CIRB, or another external institution.

Don't know: This option should be selected if the investigator is uncertain whether the research is exempt or should be reviewed by an IRB.

What type of review is required for your project?*

□ Exempt research
■ IRB-reviewed research (includes WCG IRB, NCI, CIRB, and other external IRB review)
□ Don't know (screening questions to determine if exempt research)

Review Board

Research at Ohio State involving human subjects that requires Institutional Review Board (IRB) review is reviewed by one of three university IRBs or one of multiple external IRBs, including WIRB-Copernicus Group IRB, National Cancer Institute Central IRB (CIRB), Nationwide Children's Hospital (NCH) IRB, and Advarra IRB. Board assignments are made to ensure that proposed research receives appropriate scientific or scholarly review by individuals with the qualifications to determine that the rights and welfare of research participants are protected. Final board assignment is determined by ORRP.

Selection of one of the three Ohio State IRBs below will connect to the initial review of human subjects research.

Selection of one of the external (non-Ohio State) IRBs will connect to an external review application which provides the necessary information for ORRP staff to perform pre-screening of the application to determine that institutional requirements have been met (e.g., COI disclosure, education) and that the research meets the conditions necessary to be forwarded for external IRB review.

Select the board to review this research.*

- ■ Ohio State Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB
- □ Ohio State Biomedical Sciences IRB
- □ Ohio State Cancer IRB
- □ National Cancer Institute Central IRB (CIRB)
- □ Nationwide Children's Hospital IRB
- □ WIRB-Copernicus Group IRB
- □ Advarra IRB
- □ Other external IRB

Multi-site Study

Multisite research includes projects or studies that involve collaboration with sites or individuals external to Ohio State. The IRB must determine whether external sites or personnel need IRB approval in order to participate in study activities.

EXAMPLES OF MULTI-SITE RESEARCH:

- Ohio State is the lead institution of a group of sites participating in the same research project, where all sites are recruiting subjects and administering research interventions.
- An Ohio State investigator is participating in a research project, where another institution is the lead institution.
- Ohio State is the IRB of record for one or more other sites participating in a research project.

EXAMPLES OF NON-MULTI-SITE RESEARCH:

- An Ohio State investigator is conducting research at a local elementary school that involves recruiting participants and performing study interventions, where no school employees are engaged in the research.
- An Ohio State investigator and research staff interact with clients at a local pharmacy, and a letter of support from the pharmacy is in place.

Is this a multi-site study?*	□ Yes ■ No

Location of Research

Research to be conducted at locations other than approved performance sites may require a letter of support or another institution's approval if personnel are engaged. See OHRP Engagement Guidance or contact ORRP at irbagreements@osu.edu or 614-688-8457 for more information.

Ohio State Approved Research Sites

Ohio State Columbus Campus

Address	242 W. 18th Avenue Columbus, OH

Domestic Research Sites – Non-Ohio State Locations

From the home computer of participants

Address	
Research activities by	Ohio State personnel only
Using OSU as IRB of record	
Letter of support / IRB approval	Uploaded Files

No files have been uploaded.

International Research Sites

You have listed no international research sites.

Study Personnel

Enter all Ohio State study team members below. External collaborators will be entered on a different page. Study team members should only be listed in one category (i.e., PI, co-investigator, or key personnel).

Co-investigators and key personnel are defined as individuals who participate in the design, conduct, or reporting of human subjects research. At a minimum, include individuals who recruit participants, obtain consent, or who collect study data.

Additional contacts can also serve in another role on the project.

All individuals listed as Ohio State study team members will have access to all submitted information, including completion status of team members' administrative and training requirements (CITI, RCR, COI disclosure), and may edit submissions on behalf of the principal investigator.

Electronic signatures are required of all Ohio State investigators named on the submission.

Study Team

Key Personnel - Erin Drouin

Contact Information	Academic Information
Email: drouin.6@osu.edu	Graduate Fellow (4875)
Phone:	Graduate School | Administration (cc10511)

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Affairs
(Academic_Affairs_CCH6)
0% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Conduct follow-up visits; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation; Maintain regulatory documentation;

Key Personnel - Jeffrey Chladil

Contact Information

Email: chladil.1@osu.edu
Phone:

Academic Information

Student
0% FTE

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)
Pint House

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results;

Key Personnel - James Logan

Contact Information

Email: logan.471@osu.edu
Phone:

Academic Information

Student Assistant (7968)
Arts and Sciences | Mathematics (cc12396)
Arts and Sciences
(Arts_and_Sciences_CCH6)
12.5% FTE

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Conduct follow-up visits; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results;

Key Personnel - Monica Pannett

Contact Information

Email: pannett.4@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Student Assistant 2 (STUDENT2)
Strategic Enrollment | Undergraduate Admissions (cc10720)
Academic Affairs (Academic_Affairs_CCH6)
12.5% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

Key Personnel - Katelyn Lacor

Contact Information

Email: lacor.1@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Student
0% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

Key Personnel - Megan McGhee

Contact Information

Email: mcghee.158@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Student Assistant 1 (STUDENT1)
Student Life | Dining Services (cc11449)
Student Life (CUSTOM_ORGANIZATION-3-20484)
12.5% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data

collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

Key Personnel - Michael Sauer

Contact Information

Email: sauer.187@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Student
0% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

Key Personnel - Faye Toman

Contact Information

Email: toman.22@osu.edu
Phone:

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Information

Student Assistant (7968)
Student Life | Recreational Sports Administration (cc11380)
Student Life (CUSTOM_ORGANIZATION-3-20484)
12.5% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

Key Personnel - Nia Cain

Contact Information

Email: cain.363@osu.edu
Phone:

Academic Information

Student Assistant 1 (STUDENT1)
Libraries | Content and Access (cc12945)

Conflict of Interest (COI)

✓ Completed (Expires: 06/30/2023)

Academic Affairs
(Academic_Affairs_CCH6)
12.5% FTE

Activities Performed

Protocol development/study design; Recruitment; Assess participant eligibility; Obtain consent/parental permission/assent; Interview participants/administer surveys; Conduct follow-up visits; Data collection/entry/coding; Data analysis/interpretation; Reporting results; Manuscript preparation;

External Co-Investigators & Key Personnel

Enter the names of external collaborators who are engaged in the research. Only external personnel whose activities will be covered by an Ohio State IRB should be included.

"Engaged" individuals are those who intervene or interact with participants in the context of the research or who will obtain individually identifiable private information for research funded, supervised, or coordinated by Ohio State University. See OHRP Engagement Guidance or contact ORRP at irbagreements@osu.edu or 614-688-8457 for more information.

External Collaborators

You have listed no external collaborators.

Funding and Financial Conflicts

If the research is federally funded and involves a subcontract to or from another entity, an IRB Authorization Agreement may be required. Contact ORRP for more information.

Is the research funded or has funding been requested?*

■ Yes
□ No
□ Pending

Sponsors

Internal funds (e.g., departmental, discretionary, start-up, seed grant, etc.)

■ Yes

Is any support other than monetary (e.g., drugs, equipment, etc.) being provided for the study?*	□ No □ Pending
Please specify the support and provider:*	Qualtrics Online Survey Software

Provide a copy of the grant application or funding proposal.

Uploaded Files

No files have been uploaded.

Financial Conflict of Interest

All Ohio State investigators and key personnel must have a current COI disclosure (updated as necessary for the proposed research) before IRB review. Examples of financial interests that must be disclosed include (but are not limited to) consulting fees or honoraria; stocks, stock options or other ownership interests; and patents, copyrights and royalties from such rights. For more information, see Office of Research Compliance COI Overview and eCOI.

Please indicate if any Ohio State University investigator (including principal or co-investigator), key personnel, or their immediate family members has a financial conflict (including salary or other payments for services, equity interests, or intellectual property rights) that would reasonably appear to be affected by the research, or a financial interest in any entity whose financial interest would reasonably appear to be affected by the research.

Select 'none' if no financial conflicts exist.*

■ None
□ Jason Coronel
□ Erin Drouin
□ Jeffrey Chladil
□ James Logan
□ Monica Pannett
□ Katelyn Lacor
□ Megan McGhee
□ Michael Sauer
□ Faye Toman

□ Nia Cain

Conditions required for expedited IRB review

The Federal Regulations establish two main criteria for an expedited review:

a. The research may not involve more than "minimal risk." "Minimal risk" means that “the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests” (45 CFR 46.102(i) and 21 CFR 56.102(i)).
b. The entire research project must be consistent with one or more of the federally defined categories.

The expedited review procedure may not be used where identification of the participants and/or their responses would reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participant's financial standing, employability, insurability, reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risks related to invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.

The expedited review procedure may not be used for classified research involving human subjects.

Investigators are reminded that the standard requirements for informed consent (or its waiver, alteration, or exception) apply regardless of the type of review (i.e., expedited or convened) utilized by the IRB.

Protocols involving the collection, storage, and/or distribution of data and/or specimens for future research uses do not qualify for expedited IRB review. Convened review is required.

For more information regarding the expedited review procedures, see the Expedited Review Procedures policy.

Are you requesting **Expedited Review**?*

■ Yes □ No

Expedited Review Categories

Select the appropriate category(ies) for expedited review that describe the proposed research. Check all that apply. If the research meets the conditions for expedited review, the review of the protocol will be carried out by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among members of the IRB. See 45 CFR 46 and 21 CFR 56 for more information.

The categories in this list apply regardless of the age of the participants, except as noted.

Category #1

Category #1 may not be used with Ohio State Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB.

Category #2

Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:

a. From healthy, non-pregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these participants, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.
b. From other adults and children (defined as persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.45 CFR 46.402(a)), considering the age, weight, and health of the participants, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these participants, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

□ Apply for category #2

Category #3

Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by non-invasive means.

a. Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated

fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

□ Apply for category #3

Category #4

Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

a. Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the participant or an invasion of the participant's privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

□ Apply for category #4

Category #5

Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis).

□ Apply for category #5

Category #6

Collection of data from voice, video, digital or image recordings made for research purposes.

□ Apply for category #6

Category #7

Research made on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

■ Apply for category #7

Institutional Approvals

Check all that apply and provide applicable documentation.

■ No institutional approval

Comprehensive Cancer Center (CCC) Clinical Scientific Review Committee (CSRC)

Approval or exemption required prior to IRB review for all cancer-related research.

□ Comprehensive Cancer Center (CCC) Clinical Scientific Review Committee (CSRC)

Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)

Approval required prior to IRB review for research involving biohazards (recombinant DNA, infectious or select agents, viruses, toxins), gene transfer, or xenotransplantation.
Note: Laboratories processing clinical research samples (e.g., blood, serum, tissue, urine, feces, saliva, bile), must be registered with the IBC. As applicable, contact IBCinfo@osu.edu to confirm laboratory registration.

□ Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)

Summary, Background, and Objectives

Summarize the proposed research using **non-technical** language that can be readily understood by someone outside the discipline. **Use complete sentences (limit 300 words).** *

This study will allow us to understand how individuals may use counter-argumentation and motivated reasoning in the evaluation of their romantic partners. Specifically, this study will induce a feeling of cognitive dissonance in one's romantic partner and see how they resolve that feeling. This study will also allow us to understand how different types of gender attitudes will affect individuals' views of their romantic partners. Our central thesis is that individuals who believe that their romantic partners endorse sexist views will counterargue that information and end up with an overall evaluation that their partners are less sexist than they would have had they not been shown any of that information. Utilizing a laboratory experiment, we intend to bring couples into the laboratory and separate them for the duration of the experiment. Participants will be shown vignettes of interpersonal conflicts and be asked to determine who they think was in the right/wrong in the conflict. A few of the vignettes will depict conflicts that deal with sexism. What will be varied is that individuals are exposed (or not) to their partner's answers to who was right/wrong in the conflict. Essentially, participants in a treatment condition will be shown that their partner identified a sexist individual to be in the 'right'. We will also be testing this hypothesis utilizing an online experiment. Instead of studying couples within the laboratory, the online experiment will ask individuals in romantic relationships to engage in an activity that will induce a similar level of cognitive dissonance. Specifically, individuals will be asked to do a writing activity where they reflect on instances in which their partner has said either a) things they don't like about women b) things about women they do like c) things they like about people generally or d) things they don't like about people generally. Essentially, participants in treatment conditions (a and b) will be forced to think about their partners' thoughts about women.

Summarize existing knowledge and previous work that support the expectation of obtaining useful results without undue risk to human subjects. **Use complete sentences (limit 300 words).** *

This project seeks to identify a potential mechanism for why individuals may not say something when they witness someone they know and like communicating prejudice. Conventional wisdom would suggest that individuals, particularly ones with egalitarian values, do not like when their loved ones say something prejudicial. In general, prejudicial comments go against what is considered normatively acceptable (Allport, 1954). So, for egalitarian individuals, the expression of prejudicial sentiments from someone close to them would be jarring. This study bridges that knowledge with insights from the cognitive psychology literature. Particularly, that literature would predict that if someone witnesses their loved one make a prejudicial remark like sexism, they are likely to experience some level of psychological discomfort. In response to that psychological discomfort, individuals will engage in strategies such as counter argumentation and reasoning to maintain their

beliefs about their loved ones (Kunda, 1990). Work from political psychology has identified that when individuals counterargue negative information about people they have positive impressions about, they will have an even more positive affect towards them than if they hadn't learned the negative information at all (Redlawsk, 2002; Redlawsk et. al, 2010). This is because they're spending more time focusing on positive information and criticizing the negative. Based on this knowledge from work on cognitive dissonance and motivated reasoning, individuals will experience psychological discomfort when their partner communicates sexist content, and that psychological discomfort will ultimately lead them to evaluate them more positively than had they not communicated anything sexist at all. This conflicts with most predictions outlined by conventional wisdom. I intend to test these proposals via two distinct types of sexist content: benevolent or hostile sexism. Hostile sexism is overt antipathy towards women. Benevolent sexism refers to positively valenced attitudes about women that are still rooted in inferiority stereotypes (Glick & Fiske, 1996). There are reasons to suspect that, depending on the type of sexism that is communicated by loved ones, individuals will be more or less motivated to counter-argue that their loved one isn't sexist. Since hostile sexism is more overt, it is easier to recognize and may lead to stronger counter-argumentation than benevolent sexism. However, it's possible that being so easy to recognize may make hostile sexism harder to counter-argue, in which case it would be expected that benevolent sexism, which is more socially acceptable, allows for individuals to engage in motivated reasoning more easily.

List the objectives and/or specific scientific or scholarly aims of the research study.*

This project seeks to understand a potential mechanism for why individuals are reticent to intervene when a loved one of theirs says something prejudicial. This project has two primary objectives. First, we aim to understand how motivated reasoning influences an individual's reaction to finding out that their romantic partner endorses a sexist statement. Our central thesis is that individuals will evaluate their romantic partners as less sexist after having witnessed them endorse sexism than when they hadn't witnessed them say something sexist at all. Second, we test this question through the lens of two types of sexism, hostile and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is more egregious and benevolent sexism is more palatable. It's possible that hostile sexism is too egregious to be counterargued, functioning as a 'tipping point' where individuals can only counterargue against benevolent sexism. Conversely, it's also possible that individuals counterargue more when finding out their partner endorsed a hostile sexist statement, due to the egregious nature of the statement.

Upload research protocol*

Uploaded Files

Research Protocol_CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 01/26/2023

Research Methods & Activities

Use the boxes provided below to provide information on all interventions and activities that are to be performed in the research. Based on the selections chosen in the list of activities and components, completion of additional form pages may be necessary to provide required information for IRB review.

Identify and describe all interventions and interactions that are to be performed solely for the research study.*

The goal of this study is to deceive participants into thinking that their romantic partner endorsed a sexist statement. For the laboratory study: Upon arrival, both members of the couple will be placed into separate rooms and told that they are participating in a study that examines how romantic couples agree with one another. Afterwards, Informed Consent is obtained from the participants through an online form powered by Qualtrics. Participants will then be asked to fill out a survey that measures information about their relationship as well as how they feel about their partner. Some of these relationship measures, such as a measure describing their partner, will be repeated at the start and end of the experiment. Pivotally, individuals will participate in a set of tasks that ask them to read descriptions of interpersonal conflicts and choose a person to side with within that conflict. Participants will then later be shown who their partner sided within in regard to the interpersonal conflict. Pivotally, participants will be manipulated into thinking that, for interpersonal conflict descriptions that include a sexist statement, their partner sided with the sexist individual. They will then be asked a series of survey questions about those within the interpersonal conflict and those who agree with them, as well as more survey questionnaires evaluating how they feel about their partner. This is a two condition experiment in which participants will think their partner either endorsed hostile or benevolent sexism. For the online study: Individuals will be asked to read through and give informed consent for study participation. Then, individuals will be asked the screener questions (age, romantic relationship information, views about gender). Participants will then be asked to fill out a survey that measures information about their relationship as well as how they feel about their partner. Some of these relationship measures, such as a measure describing their partner, will be repeated at the start and end of the experiment. Then, for our treatment, participants will be asked to engage in a writing activity that asks them to write about how their partner feels positive or negatively about women or people, depending on the treatment condition. This will induce feelings of dissonance about a person's partner. They will then be asked more survey questionnaires related to how they feel about their partner.

Check all research activities and/or components that apply.*

□ Audio, video, digital, or image recordings
□ Biological sampling (other than blood)
□ Coordinating center
□ Data repositories (future unspecified use, including research databases)
□ Data, not publicly available
□ Data, publicly available (e.g., census data, unrestricted data sets)
■ Deception
□ Diet, exercise, or sleep modifications
□ Focus groups
□ Food supplements
□ Genetic testing
□ Internet or e-mail data collection
□ Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)
■ Materials that may be considered sensitive, offensive, threatening, or degrading
□ Non-invasive medical procedures (e.g., EKG, Doppler)
□ Observation of participants (including field notes)
□ Oral history (does not include dental or medical history)
□ Program Protocol (Umbrella Protocol)
■ Randomization
□ Record review (which may include PHI)
□ Specimen research
□ Storage of biological materials (future unspecified use, including repositories)
□ Surveys, questionnaires, or interviews (group)
■ Surveys, questionnaires, or interviews (one-on-one)
□ Other (Specify)

Provide data collection forms, subject material, subject diaries, and/or other instruments, if applicable. Do not include case report forms for multi-site industry-initiated or cooperative group studies.

Uploaded Files

Examples of Interpersonal Conflict Passages For Judgement.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 09/01/2022

Example of Distractor Tasks.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 09/01/2022

Provide surveys, questionnaires,

Uploaded Files

Instructions and Measures_CLEAN.docx

interview guides, and/or focus group guides, if applicable.*

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 02/06/2023

Provide subject information, such as newsletters, instruction sheets, appointment reminder cards, drug/device information, if applicable.

Uploaded Files

No files have been uploaded.

Deception

Complete the fields below to request the use of deception in the proposed research. Additional guidance regarding deception can be found at the American Psychological Association website and within the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct.

Deception – A procedure in which investigators deliberately mislead participants during research by withholding information or providing false information. As a result, participants are not fully informed about the research when they consent to participate.

Describe which aspects of the research procedures will be withheld from the participants.*

For the experiment, we are concealing the study's goal and inducing cognitive dissonance. Further, for the laboratory study, we are deceiving participants into thinking that their partner agreed with an individual who expressed a sexist statement. We will also be concealing the true purpose of the study by using a deceptive name for the study on recruitment materials and the consent form. This is so participants don't know that the true nature of the study is to evaluate their partners' views related to gender, which is susceptible to social desirability effects.

Provide the scientific rationale for deceiving the participants.*

Telling participants what we are looking for will likely influence the way participants engage with the study. Specifically, in order to induce individuals to experience cognitive dissonance, they need to believe that their partner did actually endorse the sexist statement. If participants don't believe that they are seeing a statement their partner did in fact agree with, the key manipulation of the study will have failed. Prior studies related to

interpersonal communication and deception detection have utilized similar methods of deception (Mccornack & Parks, 1986; Burgoon et. al, 1994).

Describe how and when the participants will be told the true purpose of the research and the reason for the deception.*

Participants will be fully debriefed at the end of the experiment about the deception used in the study as well as the rationale for it.

State who will inform the participants about the deception.*

The debriefing text will be presented to participants after the completion of the experiment and the experimenter will be available to discuss it with them and answer questions

Explain the opportunities for participants to discuss their responses to the deception and/or to withdraw the use of their data from the research. *

Participants will retain all rights, including the rights to withdraw their data or cease participation at any time within TWO weeks after the date on which they participated in the study. The debriefing message will remind participants that they will have the right to withdraw their data from the pool and can contact the researcher if they wish to do so at a later date.

Alteration/Waiver of the consent process

Please indicate the type of consent process document to be used.*

■ Alteration of Consent Process
□ Waiver of Consent Process

Alteration of Consent Process

Complete the questions below to request an alteration of the consent process. NOTE: Alterations of consent do not apply to greater than minimal risk research.

For additional guidance, see HRPP policy Informed Consent Process and the Elements of Informed Consent and the IRB Reviewer Reference Sheets - Appendix 1.

Is the research (or demonstration project) subject to the approval of state or local government officials and designed to study public benefit or service programs or procedures for obtaining benefits under those programs, changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures, or changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs?*

□ Yes ■ No

Explain how the research (or research activities to which the alteration of consent applies) involves no more than minimal risk.*

Our study does not present more than minimal risk as the stimuli and questionnaires do not contain any information that will expose participants to major psychological risks. Participants may experience some brief psychological discomfort. Prior studies related to interpersonal communication and deception detection have utilized similar methods of deception (Mccornack & Parks, 1986; Burgoon et. al, 1994) so there is precedence for deceiving individuals into thinking fictional things about those whom they know interpersonally.

Explain why the alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants.*

Participants will retain all rights, including the rights to withdraw their data or cease participation at any time based on the withdrawal procedure described in the consent form and the debriefing text.

Explain why the research could not 'practicably' be carried out without the requested alteration.*

If participants become aware of the intent of the study, participants may attempt to guess what the researchers theorize, and/or behave differently from how they might naturally react. For our experimental manipulation to be properly tested, participants need to believe that the stimuli they're seeing actually comes from their partner. Thus, disclosing all information about the study may harm the collection of externally valid data.

Explain why (for research involving identifiable private information/biospecimens) the research could not 'practicably' be carried out without using such information or biospecimens in an identifiable format.*

Participants will be given subject ID numbers that will link their names to their particular subject number. It is necessary to retain this information (on a password-protected computer) in case participants opt to withdraw their data from the study within a 2-week period. Due to the nature of the study, participants may decide to withdraw their data.

Will the participants be provided with additional pertinent information after participation (e.g., debriefing)?*

■ Yes □ No

Explain why or why not.*

They will be fully debriefed after completion of the study.

Duration

Estimate the time required from each participant, including individual interactions, total time commitment, and long-term follow-up, if any. For studies with no subject time involvement, such as record review studies with a waiver of consent or observational studies, enter 'not applicable.'*

For the total experiment, participants will not spend more than an hour for the laboratory study. For the online study, participants will not spend more than half an hour.

Number of Participants

The number of participants is defined as the number of individuals who agree to participate (i.e., those who provide consent or whose records are accessed, etc.) even if all do not prove to be eligible or complete the study. The total number of research participants may be increased only with prior IRB approval.

Provide the total number of participants (or number of participant records, specimens, etc.) for whom you are seeking Ohio State University approval.*

300 individuals recruited from the community 300 individuals recruited from C-REP 600 participants recruited through MTurk

□ Unlimited participant numbers

Total number of participants* 1200

Explain how this number was derived (e.g., statistical rationale, attrition rate, etc.).*

Based on estimated effect sizes, we believe we need 300 couples to complete the study, which equates to 600 individuals for the in person study. Based on estimated effect sizes, we need 600 individuals for the online portion of the study.

Participant Population

Specify the age(s) of the individuals who may be included in the research:*

18 years or older

Specify the participant population(s). Check all participant groups that apply.*

■ Adults
□ Adults with impaired decision-making ability
□ Children
□ Neonates (uncertain viability/nonviable)
□ Non-English speaking
□ Pregnant women/fetuses – only if pregnant women will be intentionally recruited and/or studied.
□ Prisoners
■ Student research pools (e.g., psychology, linguistics)
□ Unknown (e.g., research using secondary data/specimens, non-targeted surveys, program protocols)

Specify the student research pool(s)*

■ CREP (Communication)
□ Economics
□ ESSREP (Environmental & Social Sustainability)
□ Fisher Marketing Pool
□ LOC (Linguistics)
□ Music
□ Political Science
□ REP (Psychology) - Columbus Campus
□ REP (Psychology) - Mansfield Campus
□ REP (Psychology) - Newark Campus
□ REP (Psychology) - Lima Campus

Describe the characteristics of the proposed participants, and explain how the nature of the research requires/justifies their inclusion.*

The goal of the study is to induce individuals into psychological discomfort when they think their partner said or did something sexist. Thus, we need individuals who are in romantic relationships where they are emotionally invested, so at least 3 months. Further, we need

individuals who wouldn't expect that their partner would say something sexist, so we are recruiting individuals who have egalitarian attitudes about gender. Additionally, due to differing gender dynamics between heterosexual and homosexual relationships, we will only be recruitment members of heterosexual relationships

Will any participants be excluded based on age, gender, race/ethnicity, pregnancy status, language, education, or financial status?*

■ Yes □ No

Explain the criteria and reason(s) for each exclusion.*

We are requiring participants to be 18 years of age, to be in heterosexual romantic relationships, and to have an egalitarian attitude towards gender.

Are any of the participants likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence?*

■ Yes □ No

Describe additional safeguards to protect participants' rights and welfare.*

Several factors minimize coercion. (1) Students can fulfill their goals for engaging with the program through means that do not require participation in any studies. (2) If they choose to complete studies, students select which studies they'd like to complete. (3) Incentives are modest. (4) Participants are reminded that they will suffer no penalty if they choose not to participate.

Participant Identification, Recruitment and Selection

Participant Identification

Provide evidence that you will be able to recruit the necessary number of participants to complete the study.*

We will recruit through C-REP as well as through social means to obtain participants. C-REP includes hundreds of students in communication courses at OSU and is regularly used by those in the School of Communication to recruit study participants. Past laboratory studies have been able to recruit similar numbers as well. MTurk is an online opt-in panel that includes millions of adult Americans who have expressed interest in study participation in exchange for small incentives. Academic researchers throughout the social sciences regularly use such services to recruit study participants.

Describe how potential participants will be identified (e.g., advertising, individuals known to the investigators, record review). Explain how the investigator(s) will gain access to this population, as applicable.*

Participants for this study will primarily be recruited from the following: 1. From OSU's Columbus campus through flyers posted on various OSU buildings. The flyers will contain the lab's email address and participants will be instructed to send an email to the lab's email address if they are interested in taking part in the study. 2. From the broader Columbus community through flyers posted on buildings outside of OSU (broader Columbus area). We will only post flyers if the building supervisor gives us permission to do so. The recruitment process also involves email as an email address will be on the recruitment flyers or the recruitment email. Interested participants can contact the lab via email if they are interested in taking part in the study. 3. By email to members of organizations at OSU or the broader Columbus area. If the administrator of the organization allows us to recruit, the administrator will send out our recruiting email to the organization's members. 4. Through an advertisement in the daily "onCampus Today" electronic newsletter sent out via email to OSU faculty and staff members. The advertisement will adhere to the newsletter's guidelines and will be formatted by the administrator of the newsletter so that it can be distributed in the newsletter. Interested participants who see the advertisement will be directed to contact the lab email account in order to schedule a time for participation. 5. On social media sites that allow for flyer posting, such as local community networking pages where these are commonly featured and have the permission of the page to do so. 6. Eligible participants will view a short description of our study in the C-REP Portal (SONA). They can then choose to participate if they fit the pre-determined criteria For the online study, participants will be recruited through (1) MTurk: Eligible participants will see the HIT on the MTurk web portal. Interested participants can then choose to participate online. MTurk participants can also be recruited utilizing a service called (2) Cloud Research. Cloud Research is an online toolkit that helps improve data quality accrued through MTurk. Data is still collected through MTurk.

Participant Recruitment and Selection

Select investigator(s) and/or key personnel who will recruit participants or identify records and/or specimens.*

- Jason Coronel
- Erin Drouin
- Jeffrey Chladil
- James Logan
- Monica Pannett
- Katelyn Lacor
- Megan McGhee
- Michael Sauer

- Faye Toman
- Nia Cain

Describe the process that will be used to determine participant eligibility.*

All participants will be asked to participate in a brief survey upon their expression of interest in participating in the study. This survey will assess that they are 18 years of age and have the required gender attitude and relationship status.

Describe the recruitment process, including the setting in which recruitment will take place. Enter 'not applicable' if the research involves only record review and no participant interaction.*

The recruitment process for the study involves OSU's Columbus campus through flyers posted on various OSU buildings. For the flyer postings, the researchers will ensure that the flyer postings are approved by the relevant building management body specific to each building. The recruitment process also involves email as an email address will be on the recruitment flyers. Interested participants can contact the lab via email if they are interested in taking part. Further, individuals who want to participate via C-REP can view the study on the C-REP portal SONA For the online study, eligible participants will see the HIT on the MTurk web portal. Interested participants can then choose to participate online.

Explain how the recruitment process respects potential participants' privacy.*

Only the investigators who are on this IRB have access to the email account associated with the study. Participants have the option to use a temporary email account to contact the lab if they do not feel comfortable using their personal accounts. Similarly in the online study, participants have the option to choose to withdraw their data at the end of the study.

Provide copies of proposed recruitment materials (e.g., ads, fliers, website postings, and recruitment letters).

Uploaded Files

NEW MTurk Recruiting Ad.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 01/26/2023

Recruitment Email Draft CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 03/02/2023

C-REP Recruitment CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 03/02/2023

Flyer 1 and 2 CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 03/02/2023

OnCampus Newsletter ad CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 03/02/2023

Provide copies of consent materials used during the recruitment process (e.g., oral/written scripts).

Uploaded Files

Debriefing Regular CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Consent CREP Clean.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Consent Regular Clean.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Debriefing form CREP CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

NEW Debriefing MTURK.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 01/26/2023

NEW Consent MTURK .docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 02/15/2023

Incentives to Participate

For more information regarding incentives for participation, see the ORRP policy, Recruiting Methods, Recruiting Materials, and Participant Compensation.

Will participants receive compensation or other incentives (e.g., free services, cash payments, gift certificates, classroom credit) to participate in the research study?*

■ Yes □ No

Describe the incentive, including the amount and timing of all payments, the form of payment (e.g., cash, check, gift card) and how payment will be received (e.g., mailed, in person, online).*

Laboratory Study: Students will be compensated with 1.5 credits for their participation. C-REP is run on SONA. The researchers will indicate successful completion of the study within the SONA system. Those recruited outside of C-REP will be compensated with $15 in the form of a gift card for their participation. MTurk Study: Participants will be compensated with $6 for their participation.

Alternatives to Study Participation

Other than choosing not to participate, are there any alternatives to participating in the research?*

□ Yes ■ No

Informed Consent Process

Indicate the consent process(es) to be used in the study. Check all that apply.*

□ Informed Consent - Form
■ Informed Consent - Verbal Script/Online
□ Informed Consent – Addendum
■ Alteration of Consent Process
□ Alteration of Parental Permission
□ Assent - Form
■ Debriefing Script
□ Assent - Verbal Script/Online
□ Parental Permission - Form
□ Parental Permission - Verbal Script/Online
□ Translated Consent/Assent - Form(s)
□ Waiver of Assent
□ Waiver of Consent Process
■ Waiver of Consent Documentation
□ Waiver of Parental Permission
□ Waiver of Parental Permission Documentation

Provide copies of all documents, as applicable. Attach the debriefing script or information sheet to be used to explain the research to the participants.*

Uploaded Files

Debriefing Regular CLEAN.docx
Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Consent CREP Clean.docx
Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Consent Regular Clean.docx
Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

Debriefing form CREP CLEAN.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 10/04/2022

NEW Debriefing MTURK.docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 01/26/2023

NEW Consent MTURK .docx

Uploaded by Erin Drouin on 02/15/2023

Select the investigator(s) and/or key personnel who will obtain consent from participants or their legally authorized representatives.*

□ None
□ Jason Coronel
■ Erin Drouin
■ Jeffrey Chladil
■ James Logan
■ Monica Pannett
■ Katelyn Lacor
■ Megan McGhee
■ Michael Sauer
■ Faye Toman
■ Nia Cain

Who will provide consent or permission (i.e., participant, legally authorized representative, parent and/or guardian)?*

The participant will provide consent

□ Not Applicable

Describe the consent process. Explain when and where consent will be obtained and how subjects and/or their legally authorized representatives will be provided sufficient opportunity (e.g., waiting period, if any) to consider participation.*

When participants come into the lab, the investigator immediately describes the procedures, time commitment, compensation rate, and related information to the participant, who is then given the appropriate online consent form to read and agree to participation (if they choose). No procedures will commence until the participant has given informed online consent. Before any of the online surveys begin, potential participants will be presented with an electronic copy of the consent form. They will be instructed that advancing forward in the survey means they agree to participate in the study. Participants may take as much time as they like to read through the consent form. Signatures will not be obtained because this study will be conducted on the Internet rather than in person. Participants can receive a

copy of the informed consent form from the researcher via email if they request it. Consent forms are attached to this application. This process will be used for gaining consent in all studies for this project.

□ Not Applicable

Explain how the possibility of coercion or undue influence will be minimized in the consent process.*

Before agreeing to the consent form, participants will be informed that they may leave the study at any time. They will be told that if they decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty and their decision will not affect their future relationship with The Ohio State University.

□ Not Applicable

Will any other tools (e.g., quizzes, visual aids, information sheets) be used during the consent process to assist participant comprehension?*

□ Yes ■ No

Will any other consent forms be used (e.g., for clinical procedures such as MRI, surgery, etc.)?*

□ Yes ■ No

Waiver of Consent Documentation

Complete the questions below to request a waiver of consent documentation for the proposed research. DHHS regulations permit waivers of documentation of the consent process if the research meets certain conditions. DHHS and FDA regulations differ regarding when an IRB may waive the requirement to document the informed consent process.

For additional guidance, see HRPP policy Documentation of the Informed Consent Process and the IRB Reviewer Reference Sheets - Appendix 2.

Is this research subject to FDA regulations (e.g., involves use of a food, drug, biologic, device)?*

□ Yes ■ No

Does the research (or research activities to which the waiver of documentation applies) present greater than minimal risk?*

□ Yes ■ No

Does the research involve procedures for which written consent is normally required outside the research context?*

□ Yes ■ No

Explain how the research does not present greater than minimal risk and does not normally require written consent outside the research context.*

Participation in the experiment will induce minimal psychological discomfort and present minimal risk to the participant. Prior studies related to interpersonal communication and deception detection have utilized similar methods of deception (Mccornack & Parks, 1986; Burgoon et. al, 1994) so there is precedence for deceiving individuals into thinking fictional things about those whom they know interpersonally. The deception here should not cause significant or long term stress for the individual participants.

Privacy of Participants

Describe the provisions to protect the privacy interests of the participants.*

Participant's privacy will be protected at all times. Only the investigators will have access to identifiable information, which will be deleted following the completion of data collection. All data will be made anonymous. Participants will not be photographed or videotaped. They will also not be asked any personal questions in a public setting or disclose any information that does not have any direct relation with the study.

Does the research require access to personally identifiable, private information?*

□ Yes ■ No

Confidentiality of Data

Explain how information is handled, including storage, security measures (as necessary), and who will have access to the information. Include both electronic and hard copy records.*

Participants will be given subject ID numbers.. All digital data will be stored on a password protected computer in room 207 Journalism. A "data key" (password protected excel file that only the investigators can access) that links subject numbers and participant names will be established and maintained on a separate password protected computer (that only the investigators can access). Information that links subject numbers and participant names will only be kept for two weeks for each participant (in case participants choose to withdraw their data--as mentioned in the consent and debriefing forms). After two weeks, information from this data key linking a subject number with a participant's name will be deleted. Any questionnaires that are administered via an online program (e.g., Qualtrics) will not be linked with any identifying information. All surveys are security encrypted using 128 bit SSL technology. The Qualtrics survey program will utilize computer IP addresses to prevent multiple survey responses from the same individual; however, these IP addresses will not be available to or accessed by any of the investigators.

Explain if any personal or sensitive information that could be potentially damaging to participants (e.g., relating to illegal behaviors, alcohol or drug use, sexual attitudes, mental health, etc.) will be collected.*

We will not collect any personal or sensitive information that could be potentially damaging to the participants.

□ Not Applicable

Explain any circumstances (ethical or legal) where it would be necessary to break confidentiality.*

There may be circumstances where it would be necessary to break confidentiality. For example, personal information regarding a person's participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, records may be reviewed by the following groups : Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices.

□ Not Applicable

Indicate what will happen to identifiable data at the end of the study*

□ Identifiable data will not be collected
■ Identifiers will be permanently removed from the data and destroyed (resulting in de-identified data)
□ Identifiable/coded(linked) data will be retained and stored confidentially (as appropriate)
□ Identifiable data will be retained and may be made public with participant consent (e.g., ethnographic research)

Certificate of Confidentiality

If your study is not NIH-funded, will you be requesting a Certificate of Confidentiality from the NIH?

□ Yes ■ No

HIPAA Research Authorization

PHI is health information that is individually identifiable and created or held by a covered entity. Health information is considered individually identifiable when it contains one or more of the 18 HIPAA identifiers or when there is a reasonable basis to believe the information can be used to identify an individual.

For more information, see 45 CFR Parts 160 and 164 or Protecting Personal Health Information in Research: Understanding the HIPAA Privacy Rule.

Authorization: although similar to informed consent, an authorization focuses on privacy risks and permission to specifically use or disclose PHI.

Partial waiver of HIPAA authorization: permits access to and use of PHI for recruitment purposes, prior to obtaining authorization. Specifically, it allows for the identification and, as appropriate, contact of potential participants to determine their interest in study participation. Note: A partial waiver does not permit retention or other use of the information beyond its original purpose.

Full waiver of HIPAA authorization: waives the requirement to obtain an individual's authorization for the use of PHI for a particular research project (such as a retrospective chart review), or for a specific portion/population of the research (such as a waiver that applies only to review of health records of patients previously treated that are used as controls).

Alteration of HIPAA authorization: allows a change in certain authorization requirements, while still requiring authorization for the use of PHI. Examples include making an exception to the required language in an authorization form or eliminating the requirement to obtain a signed authorization (e.g., authorization provided over the phone).

This information below is un-editable and can only be revised with the submission of an amendment after approval or withdrawal of the continuing review submission.

For more information, please see https://go.osu.edu/irb-hipaa.

Is individually identifiable Protected Health Information (PHI) subject to the HIPAA Privacy Rule requirements to be accessed, used, or disclosed in the research study?*

□ Yes ■ No

Reasonably Anticipated Benefits

List the potential benefits that participants may expect as a result of this research study. State if there are no direct benefits to individual participants.*

No direct benefits to participants are anticipated.

List the potential benefits that society and/or others may expect as a result of this research study.*

This study is important because it will allow us to understand the process of individuals who express sexist sentiments often go without being checked by their peers

Risks, Harms & Discomforts

Describe all reasonably expected risks, harms, and/or discomforts that may apply to the research. Discuss severity and likelihood of occurrence. As applicable, include potential risks to an embryo or fetus if a woman is or may become pregnant.*

The risks, harms, and/or discomforts associated with this research are minimal. Although individuals may experience some psychological discomfort by thinking their partner endorsed a sexist view, that experience will be brief and should not be significant, they will be induced into thinking their partner may have endorsed a sexist statement.

Describe how risks, harms, and/or discomforts will be minimized.*

Because the experimental procedure and the measurement practice are well-established (i.e., all grounded in the published research), we expect that the risks, harms, and/or discomforts associated with the proposed study should be minimal. In addition, participants can stop their participation at any time.

Assessment of Risks & Benefits

Discuss how risks to participants are reasonable when compared to the anticipated benefits to participants (if any) and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be

expected to result.*

The risks involved in this study are minimal. However, the proposed study might offer significant practical benefits for society by offering insights into how individuals who express sexist sentiments don't receive social stigmatization. Hence, the risks are minimal, and there are significant social benefits associated with the study.

Monitoring

Does the research involve greater than minimal risk (i.e., are the harms or discomforts described for the study beyond what is ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological tests)?*

□ Yes ■ No

Participant Costs/Reimbursements

Are there any additional costs that may result from study participation (e.g., parking, study drugs, diagnostic tests, etc.)?*

□ Yes ■ No

Uploaded Files Review

To access or upload a file, click on a page below.

Domestic Site Documentation

From the home computer of participants

No documents have been added to From the home computer of participants for review.

International Site Documentation

No documents have been added for review.

Grant Applications

No documents have been added for review.

Research Protocol

Research Protocol_CLEAN.docx	01/26/2023

Data collection forms and/or other instruments

Examples of Interpersonal Conflict Passages For Judgement.docx	09/01/2022
Example of Distractor Tasks.docx	09/01/2022

Subject Information

No documents have been added for review.

Surveys and/or questionnaires

Instructions and Measures_CLEAN.docx	02/06/2023

Recruitment materials (e.g., ads, fliers, website postings, and letters)

NEW MTurk Recruiting Ad.docx	01/26/2023
Recruitment Email Draft CLEAN.docx	03/02/2023
C-REP Recruitment CLEAN.docx	03/02/2023
Flyer 1 and 2 CLEAN.docx	03/02/2023
OnCampus Newsletter ad CLEAN.docx	03/02/2023

Consent Process

Debriefing Regular CLEAN.docx	10/04/2022
Consent CREP Clean.docx	10/04/2022
Consent Regular Clean.docx	10/04/2022
Debriefing form CREP CLEAN.docx	10/04/2022
NEW Debriefing MTURK.docx	01/26/2023
NEW Consent MTURK .docx	02/15/2023

Other Files

No documents have been added for review.

Other Files/Comments

This page should be used to provide ORRP or the IRB with additional information related to the current submission.

The general comments text area can be used to provide clarification to ORRP staff or the IRB members.

The general upload box below should be used to upload any additional documents necessary for this submission that were not already captured previously in the form. Examples of documents which may be uploaded include the detailed cover letter response for modifications or deferrals, IRB approvals for external sites at the time of continuing review, or a memo to IRB reviewers from the investigator.

Uploaded Files

No files have been uploaded.

Additional comments for this submission.

Changes made to the text for the Flier TRACKED CHANGES document had the changes tracked that were made for the text. Other changes made were to the background of the document, which did not allow me to track changes. These are purely aesthetic and does not change the actual content of the flier.