|  |
| --- |
| School of Psychology, UNSWRequest for Additional Participants from PSYCH 1 |
| * Complete this form if:  1. you wish to receivean additional allocation of Psych 1 participants for **a previously-approved HREAP project.** [Do NOT use this form if you are seeking approval for a new project; use the Ethics Approval Application Form.] 2. you wish to receive an allocation of Psych 1 participants for **an HREC-approved project.**   [Attach a copy of the approval letter from HREC]  **•** Submit completed form as a separate Word document, and any additional attachments as a single pdf to the Compliance Checker for your lab or research group (zip files, and multiple attachments will be returned unprocessed).   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **HREAP File Number** | HC210148 | | **Approval Date** *(from DVC-R)* | 09-Apr-2021 | | **Previous SONA Number** *(if known)* | SONA 45 | | **Project Title** | The Psychology of (Not) Wanting To Know | | **Name of Researcher** | Amy Li | | **Researcher’s email address** | amy.x.li@unsw.edu.au | | **Name of Supervisor** *(if applicable)* | Benjamin Newell | | **Supervisor’s email address** *(if applicable)* | ben.newell@unsw.edu.au | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Request for Allocation of Psychology 1 Participants (cont.) | PART 1 | PART 2  *[Only fill out this column if the study spans two sessions]* |
| Duration (in 15 min increments – minimum: 15 minutes) *If more than 1 hour, attach justification.* Please see **Attachment 1** for justification of study length. | 1.5 hours |  |
| Requested credit per participant (in 0.25 point increments – minimum: 0.25 point; for multi-part studies, provide credit for each part, do not include homework/prework ‘additional’ credit) | 1.5 |  |
| Requested number of participants | 29 | |
| Total requested hours (credit per participant X number of participants) | 29 | |
| *If more than 100 hours, provide justification here.* | | |
|  | |  |
| Preparation instructions [Optional. Indicate tasks participants will need to do or not do prior to arriving at the study.] | | |
| Eligibility criteria [Optional. Note, this is *not* based on pre-screening.] You will not be eligible to participant in the study if you meet ***any*** of the following criterial:   * Under the age of 18 * Have a diagnosed anxiety condition * Have an existing/potential heart condition | | |
| Tick this box if *either/both* Part 1 and Part 2 of your study will run online.  Tick this box if your study has Pre-Screening Criteria  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Please answer the following questions (if your project does not involve face-to-face data collection, please answer N/A to the Physical Distancing items):  • My project will comply with the policy for **Human Testing (Physical Distancing Possible)** **YES N/A**  **•** My project will comply with the policy for **Human Testing (Physical Distancing Not Possible) YES N/A**  **•** Participants will indicate their consent electronically (no written signature required) **YES** **NO** | | |
| Brief description of study, indicating the overall purposes and what the participants will be asked to do: [Required. Strictly no more than 245 characters (including spaces and punctuation). If your study is a two-part study you must include this fact in the 245 characters. Student participants will view this information before signing up for the study.] Your application will be returned to you and may encounter a two-week delay if your description exceeds the 245-character limit, as indicated below: This study investigates peoples’ information preferences. In a decision-making task, you will receive some mild electric shocks to the finger and complete some questionnaires.  **Character count (including spaces and punctuation)** 176  Tick this box to declare that your description contains 245 characters or fewer.  Tick this box to declare that the above is the HREAP-C or HREC approved wording and does not contain any variations. | | |

Psychology 1 Mandatory Debriefing Questions

1. What are the research questions?  
2. How does this study extend previous research on this topic?  
3. What are some potential real-world implications of this research?  
4. Briefly describe a potential issue (e.g., ethical, practical) or limitation of the study (e.g., design, ecological validity).  
5. Briefly describe the study methodology (e.g., design, dependent/ independent variables, materials).  
6. Further reading (i.e., a reference to a reading/s related to the current study for curious students).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What are the research questions?  Many theories of information seeking argue that humans savour information about upcoming positive events (e.g., a holiday) and dread information about potentially negative events (e.g., whether you carry the Huntington’s gene). This experiment investigates what factors drive human information seeking and avoidance within a controlled laboratory environment. Specifically, whether humans show preferences for receiving advanced information about upcoming negative outcomes (e.g., receiving an electric shock).  2. How does this study extend previous research on this topic?  Information avoidance has yet to be produced reliably under laboratory conditions even when outcomes are aversive (e.g., microphone feedback, mutilation images or high likelihoods of losing money). In these instances, people are either indifferent or prefer early information about the event which goes against the hypothesis that individuals want to avoid information about negative events. This experiment further investigates whether this effect depends on a visceral aversive event (shock) and if this is related to a desire to reduce anxious feelings (measured by SCR).  3. What are some potential real-world implications of this research?  Selective exposure/avoidance of information can skew perceptions of reality and influence future decisions. The ability to reliably produce and study information avoidance in laboratory settings will allow for intervention studies in controlled settings (e.g., how do we encourage people to embrace health information even if it may be negative?)  4. Briefly describe a potential issue (e.g., ethical, practical) or limitation of the study (e.g., design, ecological validity).  One limitation of using skin conductance is that responses habituate over extended trials i.e., the SCR response is attenuated.   5. Briefly describe the study methodology (e.g., design, dependent/ independent variables, materials).  The study utilized a within-subjects design. The independent variable was the probability of receiving a shock (50%). A probability level of 50% is selected since the outcome is most uncertain at this level and should therefore elicit the most anxiety. The dependent variables were 1) if participants wanted to find out or keep the outcome secret and 2) skin conductance response during the delay between the choice and receiving the outcome.   6. Further reading (i.e., a reference to a reading/s related to the current study for curious students).  Gigerenzer, G., & Garcia-Retamero, R. (2017). Cassandra’s regret: The psychology of not wanting to know. Psychological Review, 124(2), 179–196. https://doi-org.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/10.1037/rev0000055 |

Approved HREAP Convenor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approved Head of School \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_