

Dissertation

Method - Draft

Participants

Students over the age of 18 at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD), within the discipline of Psychology and Counselling, were recruited. Recruitment was through the department's Experiment Management System (EMS), which awarded students course credits for participation. All participants that chose to take part did so on a voluntary basis. A total of *X* participants took part in the study, *X* Male, *X* Female and *X* Non-Binary. Participants' age ranged from *X* - *X*, with a mean age of *X* and standard deviation of *X*. Warning information regarding the participants' viewing of images involving prosthetic limbs as part of the study was presented prior to participation. All participants were required to have normal or corrected to normal vision.

Design

A 2x2 mixed subjects quantitative experimental design was used. The first independent variable (IV) was the group participants were assigned to with two levels, *Group 1* were presented with the standard prosthetic limb version, whilst *Group 2* were shown the bespoke limb cover version. This was a between subjects factor. The second IV was *image version comparisons/preferences (Version A-bespoke prosthesis or Version B-standard prosthesis)*, this was the within subjects factor. The dependent variables (DV) were the participants' *MAS questionnaire scores* from part one of the study and *response times*. The second DV was the *comparison scores and response times*. **(Insert information regarding the analysis used to process the data upon completion of the data collection stage of the study - This depends on the amount of data collected).**

Materials

The study was created on SuperLabs (Version 4.5). A physical copy of the information sheet and consent form were created. The contents of the information sheet outlined the aims of the study, presented pertinent background information on the topic area, and mapped out the structure of the study. The main purpose of the study was concealed from the participant at this stage. The consent form explicitly laid out information on participant requirements throughout the study, their rights as a participant, and information regarding the treatment of their data (to be signed and dated in agreement of the information displayed). The latter is in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018), and the former in alignment with the BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct (2021).

An adapted version of the Multidimensional Attitudes Scale Towards Persons with Disabilities (MAS) was used to measure responses in a hypothetical decision-making situation. Originally, the MAS questionnaire is a 34-item scale split into 3 sub-scales: *Affect*-16 items, *Cognitive*-10 items, and *Behaviour*-8 items. For this study, we removed the *Affect* subscale and adapted the wording on the *Cognitive* and *Behaviour* sub-scales. The reliability ratings of the latter two sub-scales are .88 and .83, respectively (Findler et al., 2007). Examples of our adapted versions of the questions are, '*I would find an excuse to leave if they came up to me in a social setting*' and '*I would be happy to start a conversation with this person in a social setting*'. Responses to these statements were on a 1-5 Likert scale ranging from 1-*Extremely Unlikely* to 5-*Extremely Likely*. Higher scores on the original scale represented more negative attitudes towards a cohort and lower scores meant more positive attitudes. However, the adapted version of this scale for the context of this study, measured the likelihood to engage in social interaction through decision-making processes. High scores for this study meant participants decided they were more likely to want to socially interact with someone, whereas lower scores meant that they were less likely to want to socially

interact with someone. All questions on the *Cognitive* subscale were reversed scored, and two on the *Behaviour* subscale (Q7 and Q8). However, for part two of the study, where comparisons of the two images were measured, and preferences were asked, there was a leading statement- '*Which version of this person...*' that was accompanied by questions that were adapted further to fit the context of the task. Examples of these questions are, '*...would you like to make feel more comfortable?*' and '*...would you be more likely to initiate a conversation with if they didn't make the first move?*'.

The image of the standard prosthetic limb version of the person was obtained from an ongoing study, separate from this one, investigating a similar avenue of prosthetic limb covers that is in contact with a company called Limb Art. The image of the bespoke prosthetic limb cover version of the person was acquired from the Limb Art website itself. Both images were of the Limb Art company owner.

A physical copy of the debrief sheet was created explaining the full purpose of the study and unveiling the study's true aims, including reiterative information regarding participants withdrawal rights. The debrief sheet also included the researcher's and principal investigator's contact details, in the event of participants having any queries about the study once they had left.

Procedure

Data collection took place in a laboratory setting at SA1 Swansea campus, University of Wales Trinity Saint David.

Participants would sign up voluntarily through EMS. Then they would arrive at the SA1 Swansea Campus of UWTSD. The researcher would collect the participant from a waiting room and bring them into the labs. Upon being seated, the researcher would present the participant with an information sheet and a consent form. Whence the participant had

read, agreed, and signed the documents (if they chose to consent, otherwise they would be debriefed appropriately and thanked); they would be collected. Subsequently, the participant would begin the study by facing the computer and following the introductory instructions on the screen mapping out the structure of the study. Next, demographic information was asked of (age and gender). The participant was then presented with explicit instructions about the task they were going to begin, outlining what part 1 (the first decision-making task) would entail, such as the presentation of an image, what responses were available, and how to answer. Then, the participants had to complete a distraction task; they had to write down as many countries as they could recall, in 2 minutes. Once completed, the participant was given information on what to do next and what would be asked of them for part 2 of the study. They completed the decision-making task of similar nature to part 1 and were thanked for their participation on the computer screen. The researcher then fully debriefed the participant, handed them a debrief sheet and verbally thanked them for their participation.