PRIFYSGOL CYMRU
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
UNIVERSITY OF WALES
Trinity Saint David
SWANSEA - ABERTAWE

Name: _____

Research Participation Log 2018/2019

Ψ

Level 5 Research Design and Analysis (M5X00913)

Study One Study Code: SWAN_Credit_WR2

1) Was the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics followed? (E.g. was informed consent gained? Were you aware of your right to withdraw? Was confidentiality upheld?)

Yes ☒ No ☐

If not, which guidelines were not followed?

Describe how the ethical guidelines were followed?

An appropriate description of the study was provided before and after the start of the experiment. Any questions or concerns were address by the researcher. The withdraw procedures were clearly explained before and after the completion of the study. The confidentiality of the participant data was guarantied. Overall, the researcher behaved in a friendly professional manner, making sure the participant didn't have any concerns with his participation .

Note:

How were you fully debriefed after completing the study? Were you provided with details of the researcher (e.g. email address) and given the opportunity to discuss with them after completion?

The contact details of the research team were provided.

Are there are any areas of improvement for this research study? (think about the materials used in the study and how the researcher carried out the study)

Not at the moment

Name (PRINT):_____

Sign: _____

Date:_____

Briefly describe/outline the study you participated in (What were you asked to do? Did you understand the purpose before/during the study?)

The study consisted of two parts:

A) A questionnaires relating to symbolic prejudice and religion.

B) Implicit association test which required the matching of positive or negative words to either positive or negative faces belonging to people with occasion or middle-eastern ethical backgrounds. They were several stages of this part of the study with the final requiring the matching of randomly generated pairs . This part of the experiment was conducted via the use of computer software.

The purpose of the study was apparent to me before the start of the experiment, due to the relatively informing description of the tasks , and my previous encounter of similar association tests .

Briefly describe your experience of taking part in this research study (positive aspects/issues that may have impacted your participation)

The association test was well constructed and using an appropriate variety of stimulus. Still, there is the possibility that a large portion of the participants including myself had previously engaged with identical tasks. Which in tern may have caused an intentional interference with their response times from the side of the participants. However, this is a pure speculation based on my own personal thoughts shortly before the study .

How were you fully debriefed after completing the study? Were you given opportunity to discuss with the researcher after completion?

The researcher provided me extensive information regarding the specific aspects of the study and the potential withdraw process. After the debrief, I was provided with an extensive amount of time for discussion of the study itself as well as additional related topics.

Are there are any areas of improvement for this research study? (think about the materials used in the study and how the researcher carried out the study)

The familiarity of the sample group with this type of experiment may have influenced the results to a certain extend. The study itself may do a good job detecting existing prejudice. However, dose not allow the investigation of personal contextual reasons and their formation. The ''segregation'' and ''generalisation'' of people according to the criteria of ''biasness '' may occur when the researcher is reporting the findings . The lack of examination of the contextual framework of their attitudes may prove counter productive to the solving of issues related to prejudice.

I absolutely don't wish to be quoted on that!

Name (PRINT):_____

Sign: _____

Date:

Briefly describe/outline the study you participated in (What were you asked to do? Did you understand the purpose before/during the study?)

The study was in the form of questionnaire design to evaluate individuals degree of prejudice. The purpose the study was the evaluation of prejudice level in the immediate aftermath of the ''Christchurch shootings''. I was not aware of the purpose of the study until its completion.

Briefly describe your experience of taking part in an online research study and how this experience differed from a lab based study (positive aspects/issues that may have impacted your

Online Study Study Code: Swan_Credit_Special

1) Was the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics followed? (E.g. was informed consent gained? Were you aware of your right to withdraw? Was confidentiality upheld?)

Yes ■ No □

If not, which guidelines were not followed?

Describe how the ethical guidelines were followed?

Assurance of confidentiality, a wright to withdraw at any point.

Note:

Study Two Study Code: SWAN_Credit_JM

1) Was the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics followed? (E.g. was informed consent gained? Were you aware of your right to withdraw? Was confidentiality upheld?)

Yes ☒ No ☐

If not, which guidelines were not followed?

Describe how the ethical guidelines were followed?

The researcher had appropriately outline the potential negative implementations from participation. Confidentiality was assured . Professional behaviour was exhibit. clear withdraw procedures outlined. Concern for participant emotional state during and after the completion of the study was accounted for . The researcher also encouraging the participant to contact him for assistance in case of any negative post study emotional effects .

Note:

How were you fully debriefed after completing the study? Were you given opportunity to discuss with the researcher after completion?

I didn't have the opportunity to be properly debrief due to unrelated to the researcher circumstances.

Are there are any areas of improvement for this research study? (think about the materials used in the study and how the researcher carried out the study)

An alternative to the jigsaw may be implemented to ensure distraction. If the goal of the investigator in the second video was simply to embed a specific fools memory of the events which have taken place in the first video , the I believe it may have had the opposite effect. Meaning that I actively tried to discount any version of events presented by him , to the best of my abilities. In that case a more sidle approach may be more viable. However, I'm not compliantly sure about the goal of the study. Therefore, I am not confident in my opinion of the second video.

Name (PRINT):_____

Sign: _____

Date:_____

Briefly describe/outline the study you participated in (What were you asked to do? Did you understand the purpose before/during the study?)

The aim of the experiment was to explore the effects of suicide prevention campaigns on students perceptions of suicidality. The study consisted of three parts. The first was intent to asses individual attitudes towards suicide and perceived degree of control over its prevention . In the second part, the participant was show a brief video from anti suicide campaign. In the third part the same questionnaire was introduced (at least this is how I perceived it) in attempt to capture any changes towards the above mentioned topic. The goal of this study become apparent to me with the introduction of the second questionnaire.

Briefly describe your experience of taking part in this research study (positive aspects/issues that may have impacted your participation)

Both questioners were presented in the beginning of the study and stayed with the participant for the full duration of the experiment. The first questionnaire stayed with the participant during the third part of the study . Due to laziness and the size of the questionnaire the participant was tempted to just copy the answers from the first questionnaire(but he didn't).

Still, I believe that though participation in this study I have acquired a more positive view towards suicide prevention, at least temporary .

How were you fully debriefed after completing the study? Were you given opportunity to discuss with the researcher after completion?

_Full debrief and opportunity for discussion was provided.

Are there are any areas of improvement for this research study? (think about the materials used in the study and how the researcher carried out the study)

To avoid any unprofessional practice when answering the questionnaires and the tasks should be separately presented. In the future the effects of different type of suicide prevention materials could be studied as well to compare their individual impact and cost effectives

Name (PRINT):_____

Sign: _____

Date:_____

Briefly describe/outline the study you participated in (What were you asked to do? Did you understand the purpose before/during the study?)

The study consisted of four parts :

A) video of a mock crime, B) mock police interview relating to the first video , C) jigsaw puzzle, D) a recollection questionnaire

During the mock police interview the ''investigator'' was interrogating a withies about the characteristics of the criminals. He was applying incorrect descriptions about items and events found in the first video with the use of non verbal articulation . After the completion of the second video jigsaw puzzle was presented. The final part consisted of questioner requiring the recollection of the specific items from the first video.

I believe I understood the purpose of the study during my engagement with the various tasks.

_____

_____

Briefly describe your experience of taking part in this research study (positive aspects/issues that may have impacted your participation)

I found the perceived by me concept of the study interesting . However , it was apparent from the beginning that at least some of the information provided by the investigator in the second video was falls. From then on, I perceived everything displayed by him as fools. This lead me to consciously attempt avoiding the answer in the questioner, which I perceived to correlate with the information received by him. This can be positive or negative depending on the design of the study. Moreover, I actively avoided the jigsaw distraction task due to my understanding of its purpose and the unreasonable amount of pieces which it contained.

Study Four Study Code: SWAN_CREDIT_KH

1) Was the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics followed? (E.g. was informed consent gained? Were you aware of your right to withdraw? Was confidentiality upheld?)

Yes ■ No ☐

If not, which guidelines were not followed?

Describe how the ethical guidelines were followed?

Professional behaviour , confidentiality , potential negative impacts of the study were outlined by the researcher, a right to withdraw during and after the study.

Note:

Study Three Study Code: SWAN_credit_JF

1) Was the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics followed? (E.g. was informed consent gained? Were you aware of your right to withdraw? Was confidentiality upheld?)

Yes ■ No □

If not, which guidelines were not followed?

Describe how the ethical guidelines were followed?

Assured confidentiality, a wright to withdraw, appropriate description of the task

Note:

How were you fully debriefed after completing the study? Were you given opportunity to discuss with the researcher after completion?

I was given a full debrief and had the opportunity for discussion._____
_____
_____
_____

Are there are any areas of improvement for this research study? (think about the materials used in the study and how the researcher carried out the study)

Although a potential pattern may be observed between people in the same year of study, perhaps a more prolong examination will be more suitable to capture any shifts towards personal tutor mentoring . An interview with select students can be conducted at the end of the 3th year in order to provide better understanding of the factors impacting the attitudes towards personal mentoring engagement .
_____
_____
_____
_____

Name (PRINT):_____

Sign: _____

Date:_____

Briefly describe/outline the study you participated in (What were you asked to do? Did you understand the purpose before/during the study?)

The study consisted of three short questioners examining :

A) attitudes towards personal tutor mentoring

B) perceived stress scale

C) resilience scale.

The aim of the study was to examine the attitudes towards personal tutor meetings across the different levels of undergraduate psychology students (level4/5/6), with consideration about of how ''reliance'' and ''perceived stress'' may affect those perceptions.

The purpose of the study become apparent to me during the engagement with the tasks

Briefly describe your experience of taking part in this research study (positive aspects/issues that may have impacted your participation)

I found it interesting, they were no issues impacting my participation.
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____