POLICY No. 21

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMANS' POLICY

MODIFICATIONS

Adopted February 2024
BG-24-002-503

Through a partnership, TAV College applied Vanier College's *Research Involving Human Participants*. With the College's permission, TAV has adapted and partially rewritten its policy for its specific needs. TAV College wishes to thank Vanier College for their partnership, contribution and generosity.

Table of contents

Scope 1
Purpose 1
Compliance with Tri-Council requirements 1
Guiding Principles 1
Respect for Persons 2
Concern for Welfare 3
Justice 4
The Research Ethics Committee 4
Definitions 5
Minimal Risk 5
Vulnerable Persons 5
Procedure: Ethical Review of Research Involving Human Participants 5
Delegated review 5
Full Review 6
Scholarly Review 6
Reconsideration of REB decisions (by REB) 6
Appeal of REB decisions by REAB 7
On-going Research Ethics Review 7
Research Not Requiring REB Review 8
Activities Not Requiring REB Review 8
Conflict of Interest 8
Free and Informed Consent 8
Procedures for Free and Informed Consent 9
Privacy and Confidentiality 12
Appendix 1 13

Scope

All research involving living human participants done at TAV College must be reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board (REB) before the research may begin. This definition is meant to cover research in which living humans are studied or asked to participate in any study where some legal and ethical responsibility rests with the College. It is also intended to include any research that makes use of information or databases containing specific information about human participants. Research involving human remains, cadavers, tissues, biological fluids, embryos or fetuses shall also be reviewed by the REB.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that those conducting research involving living human participants at TAV, whether members of the TAV community or others granted permission to conduct research at the College, respect the legitimate human interests of those affected by their research.

While recognizing the vital importance of research to human progress, TAV College affirms that the welfare and integrity of the individual or particular collective must prevail over the advancement of knowledge and the researcher's use of human participants for that purpose. The College is not itself vested with any authority to decide when an individual's rights may be superseded by the need for research, but it has a responsibility to ensure that the activities it supports respect the rights of the public it serves. These guidelines also apply to the collection of data from students at any time when those data do not pertain to course content or course pedagogy. The guidelines are offered to help the researcher and the Ethics Review Board avoid any adverse effects of research involving human participants.

Compliance with Tri-Council requirements

All researchers must comply with the guidelines in the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, established by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, as well as this and other relevant TAV policies.

Guiding Principles

The Tri-Council Policy Statement recommends that reviews be guided by the following ethical considerations:

- Respect for Persons
- Concern for Welfare
- Justice

Respect for Persons

Respect for Persons recognizes the intrinsic value of human beings and the respect and consideration that they are due. It encompasses the treatment of persons involved in research directly as participants and those who are participants because their data or human biological materials (which, for the purposes of this Policy, include materials related to human reproduction) are used in research. Respect for Persons incorporates the dual moral obligations to respect autonomy and to protect those with developing, impaired or diminished autonomy.

Autonomy includes the ability to deliberate about a decision and to act based on that deliberation. Respecting autonomy means giving due deference to a person's judgment and ensuring that the person is free to choose without interference. Autonomy is not exercised in isolation but is influenced by a person's various connections to family, to community, and to cultural, social, linguistic, religious, and other groups. Likewise, a person's decisions can have an impact on any of these connections.

An important mechanism for respecting participants' autonomy in research is the requirement to seek their free, informed, and ongoing consent. This requirement reflects the commitment that participation in research, including participation through the use of one's data or biological materials, should be a matter of choice and that, to be meaningful, the choice must be informed. An informed choice is one that is based on as complete an understanding as is reasonably possible of the purpose of the research, what it entails, and its foreseeable risks and potential benefits, both to the participant and to others. Respect for Persons also includes a commitment to accountability and transparency in the ethical conduct of research.

Certain factors may diminish a person's ability to exercise their autonomy, such as inadequate information or understanding for deliberation, or a lack of freedom to act due to controlling influences or coercion. Such constraints may include the fear of alienating those in positions of authority, such as professional or personal caregivers, researchers, leaders, larger groups, or a community to which one belongs. Other constraints may consist of barriers to accessing resources or knowledge outside the research context. These factors and constraints should be addressed prior to any research being carried out, so as to ensure participants are sufficiently protected.

Some people may be incapable of exercising autonomy because of youth, cognitive impairment, other mental health issues or illness. While autonomy may be considered a necessary condition for participation in research, involving those who lack capacity to make their own decisions to participate can be valuable, just and even necessary. For those prospective participants, additional measures are needed to protect their interests and to ensure that their wishes (to the extent that these are known) are respected. These measures will generally include seeking consent from an authorized third party who is entrusted to make decisions on behalf of the prospective participant, based on knowledge of that person and that person's wishes or, if such wishes are unknown, on consideration of that person's welfare. Even when the requirements of free, informed, and ongoing consent cannot be met, Respect for Persons requires

involving individuals in circumstances of vulnerability in decision making where possible. This may include asking about their feelings regarding participation and/or for their assent.

Where it is foreseeable that a participant may lose decision-making capacity during a research project, for example in studies of cognitive impairment, it may be appropriate to ask participants to express their preferences and ensure that they have authorized a trusted person to make decisions on their behalf should they lose the capacity to decide whether to continue their research participation. See Article 3.1 for guidance on research directives for individuals who lack decision-making capacity.

Concern for Welfare

The welfare of a person is the quality of that person's experience of life in all its aspects. Welfare consists of the impact on individuals of factors such as their physical, mental, and spiritual health, as well as their physical, economic, and social circumstances. Thus, determinants of welfare can include housing, employment, security, family life, community membership and social participation, among other aspects of life. Other contributing factors to welfare are privacy and the control of information about the person, and the treatment of human biological materials according to the free, informed and ongoing consent of the person who was the source of the information or materials. A person's or group's welfare is also affected by the welfare of those who are important to them. Harm includes any negative effects on welfare, broadly construed (for the relationship between risk and harm, see Chapter 2, Section B). Note that, for the purposes of this Policy, "group" and "community" are used in their ordinary sense. More detailed types of community as defined in Chapter 9 are specific to Indigenous contexts.

Concern for Welfare means that researchers and REBs should aim to protect the welfare of participants, and, in some circumstances, to promote that welfare in view of any foreseeable risks associated with the research. They are to provide participants with enough information to be able to adequately assess risks and potential benefits associated with their participation in the research. To do so, researchers and REBs must ensure that participants are not exposed to unnecessary risks. Researchers and REBs must attempt to minimize the risks associated with answering any given research question. They should attempt to achieve the most favourable balance of risks and potential benefits in a research proposal. Then, in keeping with the principle of Respect for Persons, participants or authorized third parties make the final judgment about the acceptability of this balance to them.

The welfare of groups can also be affected by research. Groups may benefit from the knowledge gained from the research, but they may also suffer from stigmatization, discrimination or damage to reputation. Engagement during the design process with groups whose welfare may be affected by the research can help to clarify the potential impact of the research and indicate where any negative impact on welfare can be minimized. Researchers must also consider the risks and potential benefits of their research and the knowledge it might generate for the welfare of society as a whole.

Where research on individuals may affect the welfare of a group, the weight given to the group's welfare will depend on the nature of the research being undertaken, and the individuals or group in question. This consideration does not imply, however, that the welfare of a group should be given priority over the welfare of individuals.

Justice

Justice refers to the obligation to treat people fairly and equitably. Fairness entails treating all people with equal respect and concern. Equity requires distributing the benefits and burdens of research participation in such a way that no segment of the population is unduly burdened by the harms of research or denied the benefits of the knowledge generated from it.

Treating people fairly and equitably does not always mean treating people in the same way. Differences in treatment or distribution are justified when failures to take differences into account may result in the creation or reinforcement of inequities. One important difference that must be considered for fairness and equity is vulnerability. Vulnerability is often caused by limited decision-making capacity, or limited access to social goods, such as rights, opportunities, and power. Individuals or groups whose circumstances may make them vulnerable in the context of research have historically included children, the elderly, students, women, prisoners, those with mental health issues and those with diminished capacity for self-determination. Ethnocultural minorities and those who are institutionalized are other examples of groups who have, at times, been treated unfairly and inequitably in research, or have been excluded from research opportunities. People or groups whose circumstances cause them to be vulnerable or marginalized may need to be afforded special attention in order to be treated justly in research.

The recruitment process is an important component of the fair and equitable conduct of research, for both participants who may become directly involved in research and for those who participate as the source of information or biological materials to be used in research. Participation should be based on inclusion criteria that are justified by the research question. Inequity is created when particular groups fail to receive fair benefits of research or when groups, or their data or their biological materials, are excluded from research arbitrarily or for reasons unrelated to the research question.

An important threat to Justice is the imbalance of power that may exist in the relationship between researcher and participant. Participants will generally not understand the research in the same way and in the same depth as does the researcher. Historically, there have been instances in which this power imbalance has been abused, with resulting harm to participants.

The Research Ethics Committee

The Research Ethics Committee (REB) reviews applications for research activities involving human participants as described below. The REB may approve, reject, propose changes to, or terminate any proposed or ongoing research involving human participants. The REB is also

expected to further the knowledge of and appreciation for research ethics at the College, serving as a source of information and advice to the TAV College research community.

Definitions

Minimal Risk

A situation in which the probability and magnitude of possible harms associated with the research are no greater than those that would be encountered by the subject in those aspects of his or her everyday life. This evaluation should be made from the perspective of the research subject. It may be necessary to consider the various contexts (e.g., social, economic, cultural) that shape the participant's life, to properly evaluate the implications of the research in terms of the core principles (TCSP 2, Chapter 1). In the assessment of the acceptable threshold of minimal risk, special ethical consideration must be given towards individuals or groups whose situation or circumstances make them vulnerable in the context of a specific research project.

Vulnerable Persons

Persons whose situation or characteristics may make them unable to provide free and informed consent to participate in research. This group includes children, institutionalized persons, those who have cognitive impairments, and those in a position of inferiority (see Justice as an ethical consideration). In the course of research, such individuals are entitled to caring, solidarity and fairness, to special protection against abuse, exploitation or discrimination.

Procedure: Ethical Review of Research Involving Human Participants

An Application to Conduct Research Form, completed and signed by the researcher, must be submitted to the Research Office. If the research involves human participants, the Research Office must forward the application to the REB requesting a review of the research plan. The Chair of the REB must make a preliminary determination of the level of risk to human participants involved in participating in the research. On the basis of this initial review the Chair of the REB will decide the nature of the ethical review the application should undergo. The guiding principle is that the depth of the review should be proportional to the degree of risk the research imposes on its participants. If the Chair of the REB determines that the risk is minimal, a delegated review may be recommended. Otherwise a full review will be instituted.

Delegated review

In a delegated review a sub-committee of the REB composed of three members including the Chair will decide whether the research application should be accepted as submitted, or accepted with minor modifications; in this latter case it is returned to the applicant with a request for changes. This committee may also decide that the application should undergo a

Full Review. The applicant must be informed of the decision no later than 14 days after the submission of the application. All approvals of applications under delegated review must be reported at the next meeting of the full REB. An application cannot be rejected without a Full Review and an applicant always has the right to request such a review.

Full Review

If the Chair of the REB determines that a delegated review is not appropriate; or if the applicant chooses full review, the application must be distributed to members of REB and taken up at the next available meeting. The REB may meet with the applicant to discuss the proposal, to seek additional supporting information if necessary and to permit the applicant to ask and answer questions. The applicant will not be present when the decision is made.

Scholarly Review

The TCPS recommends that:
a. The REB shall satisfy itself that the design of a research project that poses more than minimal risk is capable of addressing the questions being asked in the research.
b. The extent of the review for scholarly standards that is required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out.
c. Research in the humanities and the social sciences that poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed.
d. Certain types of research, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities, may legitimately have a negative effect on public figures in politics, business, labour, the arts or other walks of life, or on organizations. Such research should not be blocked through the use of harms-benefits analysis or because of the potentially negative nature of the findings. The safeguard for those in the public arena is through public debate and discourse and, in extremis, through action in the courts for libel.
The REB may ask for scholarly peer review by either accepting the granting agency assessment; establishing a peer review committee; undertaking the review itself if expertise exists on the committee.
If the research proposal is acceptable, the chair signs the form on behalf of the committee; if it is acceptable with modifications then the proposal is returned to applicant with suggestions for modifications; if the proposal is unacceptable, the Chair must inform the applicant in writing stating reasons for the decision; the applicant has the right to ask that decision be reconsidered.

Reconsideration of REB decisions (by REB)

If requested by the applicant, the REB must reconsider a negative decision on the research proposal and must invite the applicant to discuss the application before a second decision is rendered. This provides an opportunity for the applicant to be heard, to hear at first hand explanations of the reasons for the rejection, and to advance arguments in response to these explanations. The resulting decision, with the reasons for the decision, must be communicated to the applicant in writing, preferably within 5 working days of the meeting.

The applicant has the right to appeal a negative decision to the Research Ethics Appeal Board (REAB).

Appeal of REB decisions by REAB

An applicant who wishes to appeal a negative decision of the REB after a reconsideration must do so within 30 days after receiving the written decision of the REB. The appeal must be sent in writing, with relevant supporting documentation included, to the Director of the Research Office, who will forward the appeal request and supporting documents to the Chair of the REAB. The applicant has the right to appear in person before the REAB to discuss the case but may not be present when the decision is made.
The Research Ethics Appeal Board may sustain, modify or reverse a decision of the REB. The decision of the Research Ethics Appeal Board is final, and will be communicated in writing promptly to the applicant.

The membership of the Research Ethics Appeal Board shall be similar to that of the Research Ethics Board, and should operate under the same reporting and administrative practices as the REB. Current members of the REB shall not be eligible for membership on the REAB.

On-going Research Ethics Review

The principle of proportionality implies that, while all research projects should undergo on-going review, the regularity and rigor of such on-going review should reflect the level of risk posed to participants; the researcher (or principal researcher where there is more than one) should propose, and REB should establish, terms for ongoing review when first approval is given. The REB shall make the final determination as to the nature and frequency of continuing research ethics review in accordance with a proportionate approach to research ethics review. At minimum, continuing research ethics review shall consist of an annual status report (for multi-year research projects), and an end-of-study report (projects lasting less than one year). Any significant change in the research procedures or in research design must be reported promptly to the REB. Serious incidents must be reported immediately to the REB. Researchers must accompany any request for modification of research procedures or design with clear explanations for the reasons. The REB and researcher must collaborate to ensure that modifications meet ethical standards. Modifications must be reviewed and approved by 2 members of REB including Chair; the full REB must be notified at the next meeting.
Annual reports on the research project must be filed with the Research Officer. When the research is supported by outside funding agencies their reporting requirements must be followed. However the researcher must inform the REB upon finalizing the research.
Research at many different sites will require review and approval by the REB of all participating sites. The researcher should distinguish between core elements of the research (those that cannot be altered without invalidating the combined data from the participating institutions or centres) and those elements that may be altered to comply with local requirements without invalidating the research project. The participating REBs may choose to coordinate their review of multi-centred projects through an agreed on coordination method.

Research Not Requiring REB Review

Some research is exempt from REB review where protections are available by other means. This policy allows the following exemptions:

- Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information;
- Research involving the observation of people in public places;
- Research that relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information, or anonymous human biological materials, so long as the process of data linkage or recording or dissemination of results does not generate identifiable information.

Activities Not Requiring REB Review

The following distinguishes research requiring REB review from non-research activities that have traditionally employed methods and techniques similar to those employed in research. Such activities are not considered "research" as defined in this Policy, and do not require REB review.

- Quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, and performance reviews, or testing within normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purposes;
- Creative practice activities (a process through which an artist makes or interprets a work or works of art).
- "Research" projects with minimal risk, conducted by students as part of their course activities, where the activity's primary purpose is as a teaching/training exercise. Teachers of such courses should ensure that students adhere to ethical standards of practice as described in this policy. For additional information the teacher can contact the Research Ethics Board.

Conflict of Interest

Trust and integrity lie at the core of research activity and real or perceived conflicts of interests among researchers, research participants or members of review committees cannot be permitted to undermine that trust. All members involved in the research community have an obligation to disclose any conflict of interest that may arise during the process of proposing, reviewing, participating in or leading research activities at the College. A member of the REB or the REAB must withdraw from consideration of any issue before their committee in which the member has a personal interest.

Free and Informed Consent

Free and informed consent must be voluntarily given, without manipulation, undue influence, or coercion. There shall not be incentives offered that are so large as to become an undue influence and undermine the voluntary nature of their participation. Researchers must take care to avoid problems of informed consent based on a special relationship between researcher and participant, so that such relationship does not unduly influence the participant's free and informed consent.

Participants may withdraw their consent at any time during the research program, and such withdrawal shall not result in penalty or harm or loss of promised benefits that are not inherently dependent on completion of their participation.

Free and informed consent should normally be provided in writing (see Appendix 1). If written consent is not culturally acceptable, or where there are good reasons for not recording consent in writing, the procedures used to seek free and informed consent must be documented for review by the REB.

The REB may approve a consent procedure that does not include, or alters some or all of the elements of informed consent as noted above, or waives the informed consent, provided that the REB documents that:

1. The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants;
2. the waiver or alteration is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants;
3. the research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration;
4. whenever possible and appropriate, the participants will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation; and
5. the waiver or altered consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention.

In studies that include randomized consent or blinding in clinical trials, neither the research participants nor those responsible for their care know which treatment the participants are receiving before the project begins. Such research is not regarded as a waiver or alteration of the requirements for consent if the participants are informed of the probability of being randomly assigned to one part of the study or another.
Where any research participants express significant concern about the nature of the informed consent or the use of the research, the researcher should report the concerns to the REB.
REB review is normally required for research involving naturalistic observation, except for observation of participants in public meetings, demonstrations, political rallies or like activities where participants are expected to be seeking or are aware of public visibility. Naturalistic observation is used to study behaviour in a natural environment. If the naturalistic observation does not allow for the identification of the participants, and is not staged, then the research will normally be considered as of minimal risk. However, naturalistic observation still raises the concerns of privacy and the dignity of those being observed. Accordingly, REB review is required and free and informed consent should be obtained from the participants following this practice.

Procedures for Free and Informed Consent

When a proposal has been approved, the principal researcher (head of research team) must ensure that all participants are fully informed about the nature of the research, their roles, any risks involved and the perceived benefits of the research. They must consent in writing to participate by signing the relevant form. If written consent is not appropriate, either due to cultural norms or in situations where such written consent may pose risks to the participants

that they may be unwilling to accept, the methods used to achieve free and informed consent must be documented and reviewed by the Chair of the REB before the research may begin. The department responsible for the research must keep completed original consent forms. In situations where the demands of privacy and confidentiality require greater security than is likely to be possible within a department, such documents must be entrusted to the Research Office for safekeeping. The guidance of the Research Office should be sought if there is any doubt as to the correct course of action.
Researchers shall provide to prospective participants, or to authorized third parties, full and frank disclosure of all information relevant to their free and informed consent. Throughout this process, the researcher must ensure that prospective participants are given adequate opportunities to discuss and contemplate their participation.

Researchers shall provide at a minimum the following information:

1. Information that the person is being invited to participate in a research project;
2. comprehensible statement of the research purpose, the identity of the researcher and College, the expected duration and nature of participation, and a description of the research procedures;
3. a comprehensible description of reasonably foreseeable risks and benefits that may arise from participation in the research, as well as any consequences of non-action, particularly related to research involving treatment, or where invasive methods are involved, or where there is a potential for physical or psychological harm;
4. assurance that the prospective participants are free not to participate, and are able to withdraw at any time without prejudice;
5. assurance that the participants have ongoing opportunities to decide whether or not to continue to participate during the course of the research;
6. the potential of commercialization of research findings, and the presence of any apparent, actual, or potential conflict of interest on the part of the researchers, sponsors, or institutions;
7. the name, and contact information for a person who may be contacted for information on the nature of the research, or in the case of concerns, complaints, or consequences.

Additional information may be required, depending on the nature of the research project, including:

1. Assurance that new information will be provided to the participants in a timely manner whenever such information is relevant to the participant's decision to continue or withdraw from the research;
2. information on the resources available outside the research team to contact regarding possible ethical issues in the research;
3. an indication as to who will have access to the information collected on the identity of participants, descriptions of how confidentiality will be protected, and the anticipated uses of the data;
4. an explanation of the responsibilities of the participant;
5. information on the circumstances under which the researcher may terminate the individual's participation in the research;

6. information on any costs, payments, reimbursement for expenses, or compensation for injury;
7. in the case of randomized trials, the probability of participant assignment to each of the options;
8. the ways in which research results will be published, and how the participants will be informed of the results of the research.

Written consent must normally be obtained and properly filed.

The competence of the potential participants to provide free and informed consent is an important factor in the validity of the consent. Competence refers to the ability to understand the information presented about the research, to appreciate the potential consequences of a decision, and to provide free and informed consent to participate in a specific research project. Competence is not an all or nothing condition. The prospective participants do not need to have the capacity to make every kind of decision, only the informed decision about participation in the specific research.

Researchers must ensure that they comply with all applicable federal and provincial legislative requirements and the legislative requirements of the jurisdiction in which participation takes place.

Individuals who are not legally competent to participate in the proposed research shall only be asked to become research participants when:

1. The research question can only be addressed using the identified group(s);
2. free and informed consent is sought from their authorized representatives, such as parents or legal guardians;
3. the research does not expose them to more than minimal risk without the potential for direct benefits to them.

For research involving individuals who are not competent, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, the following conditions are met:

1. The researcher shall show how the free and informed consent will be sought from the authorized third party, and how the participant's best interests will be protected;
2. the authorized third party is not the researcher or any other member of the research team;
3. the continued free and informed consent of the authorized third party is required in order for the continuation of the participation of the legally incompetent person in the research project, as long as the person remains incompetent;
4. if the incompetent participant becomes competent during the research project, his or her informed consent will be sought as a condition of continuing participation.

If the free and informed consent has been obtained from an authorized third party, and the legally incompetent participant understands the nature and consequences of the research,

the researcher must seek to determine the wishes of the participant. If the potential participant does not agree, their participation in the research project cannot begin.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Researchers must ensure that they comply with all legislation governing the privacy of individuals that apply in the jurisdictions where the research is being performed. They must submit and gain approval from the REB of any interview procedures designed to elicit identifiable personal information from research participants, whether the interview is in person, on the telephone, electronic media or by means of individualized questionnaires.
In evaluating this aspect of research proposals the REB must consider:

1. The type of data to be collected;
2. purpose of collection;
3. limits on use, disclosure and retention of data;
4. safeguards for security and confidentiality;
5. modes of observation or access to information that allows identification of particular participants; f) anticipated secondary use of identifiable data from research;
6. anticipated linkage of data gathered in the research with other data about participants;
7. provisions for confidentiality of data resulting from the research.

The primary researcher has the exclusive right to use the data collected in any study for the approved period of time that is required for the completion of the approved research. Following this period, the researcher is encouraged to make such data available to other researchers. Secondary use of the data will not normally include access to any personal identifiers. REB approval is required for any secondary use of the data.

Appendix 1

INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

Study Title/Research Title:

Researcher:

Researcher's Contact Information:

Supervisor:

Supervisor's Contact Information:

You are being invited to participate in the research study mentioned above. This form provides information about what participating would mean. Please read it carefully before deciding if you want to participate or not. If there is anything you do not understand, or if you want more information, please ask the researcher.

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of the research is to ----------

B. PROCEDURES

If you participate, you will be asked to ----------

The interviewer will take notes during the interview and the interview will be audio-recorded.

C. RISKS AND BENEFITS

You might face certain risks by participating in this research. These risks include: ----------

This research is not intended to benefit you personally.

D. CONFIDENTIALITY

We will gather the following information as part of this research: ----------

We will not allow anyone to access the information, except for the researcher and the faculty supervisor named in this form. We will only use the information for the purposes of the research described in this form.

The information gathered will be coded. That means that the information will be identified by a code. Only the researcher will have a list that links the code to your name.

We will protect digital information by ----------

We intend to publish the results of the research. However, it will not be possible to identify you in the published results.

We will destroy the information five years after the end of the study.

E. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

You do not have to participate in this research. It is purely your decision. If you do participate, you can stop at any time. You can also ask that the information you provided not be used, and your choice will be respected. If you decide that you don't want us to use your information, you must tell the researcher before the interview ends.

As compensation for participating in this research, ----------

There are no negative consequences for not participating, stopping in the middle, or asking us not to use your information.

F. PARTICIPANT'S DECLARATION

I have read and understood this form. I have had the chance to ask questions and any questions have been answered. I agree to participate in this research under the conditions described.

NAME (please print): _____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

If you have questions about the scientific or scholarly aspects of this research, please contact the researcher. Their contact information is on page 1. You may also contact their faculty supervisor.

If you have concerns about ethical issues in this research, please contact: ----------