

# Ethics form

[Business](#)



ETHICS REVIEW FORM Researcher Ahmed Tawfik Reviewer (DA): David Dick  
Review: 20. 8 Each of the ethical criteria below must beadequately  
addressed by the researcher in order to obtain ethics approval.

The RESEARCHER should perform a self-check using these 25 questions  
before submitting the ethics form to the DA.

The ETHICS REVIEWER (DA) will complete the yellow column for each  
question to indicate whether revisions are required for ethics approval. The  
DA will also render a decision at the end of this form.

The RESEARCHER must respond in the blue column when resubmitting ethics  
materials.

Ethics Reviewer’s assessment:

(In each row, the Ethics Reviewer should either type “ yes” or “ no.” With  
each “ no,” the reviewer must specify what revisions are needed to which  
specific parts of the ethics application to obtain ethics approval.)

Researcher response:

The researcher must use this column to describe how and where each of the  
ethics reviewer’s concerns (in the yellow column) has been addressed.

The first 6 questions apply to all studies, including analysis of existing data.

1. Are procedures adequately described such that the study’s potential risks  
and benefits can be discerned?

Procedures are described by using empirical fact backed qualitative analysis  
to make potential risks and benefits stand out.

2. Are the research risks reasonable, relative to the importance of the  
knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result?

Much emphasis was dwelt on the importance of the knowledge that may be  
expected and so it minimized focus on risk. This generally made research

<https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

risks reasonable in relation to importance.

3. Has the researcher proactively managed any potential conflicts of interest?

Issues of conflict were catered for in the selection of respondents and sources of existing data to ensure none of the respondents had any preemption that had to do with their personal interests.

4. Will the data be stored for at least 5 years with adequate provisions to maintain the confidentiality of the data?

Apart from the fact that no identities of respondents were disclosed, researcher also developed a safe keeping mechanism for all data collected to ensure that data lasted longer.

5. Will research subjects' identities and contact info be adequately protected? For secondary data analyses, the proposal must clearly state when/how de-identification will occur.

Most data were collected anonymously as a means of protecting their identity.

6. Has the research site provided a letter or email (from a confirmable source) granting permission for all relevant data access, facility use, and use of personnel time for research purposes? Note that when medical, educational, or business records would be analyzed or used to identify potential research participants, the site needs to explicitly approve access to data for research purposes (even if the researcher normally has access to that data to perform their job).

Yes, there are letters of permission from important institutions that were featured.

The remaining questions only apply to studies that involve recruiting

<https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

participants to collect new data.

7. Do the informed consent procedures provide adequate time to review the study information and ask questions before giving consent?

It was for the need to ensure that respondents had adequate time in reviewing their questions that questionnaire was preferred over interview. With questionnaire, respondents were free to attend to questions at any suitable time for them without rush.

8. Will informed consent will be appropriately documented? (While a consent signature is standard, note that anonymous surveys can obtain implied consent by informing the participant, " To protect your privacy, no consent signature is requested. Instead, you may indicate your consent by clicking here/returning this survey in the enclosed envelope.")

There will be a technologically backed documentation of consent forms so as to ensure backup protection.

9. Is the participant information sheet (PIS) written using language that will be understandable to the potential participants?

Considering that the educational background and intellectual knowledge of respondents could not be guaranteed, very simple language that are easy to understand was used.

10. Does the PIS explain how the subject was selected?

The PIS clearly puts out that a purposive sampling was used with a view of selecting only people with adequate knowledge and practical experience on EEI to participant

11. Does the PIS disclose all potential conflicts of interest?

As far as participants are concerned, conflict of interest was avoided by ensuring that questions were given to respondents in such a way that

<https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

participants did not deal with questions that bore their direct interest.

12. Does the PIS include an understandable explanation of the research purpose?

The central explanation of the PIS was based on the research purpose. The statement of research purpose thus formed the first sentence of the PIS so as to ensure that participants came to appreciate the research purpose.

13. Does the PIS include an understandable description of the data collection procedures?

It was stated in the PIS that the data collection procedure was going to be done through primary data collection

14. Does the PIS include an estimate of the time commitment for participation?

It was estimated that each participant would use a maximum of one week to complete the questionnaire.

15. Does the PIS include a description of reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts?

Potential discomforts were identified and explained beforehand to participants and so no one who felt uncomfortable was forced to participate.

16. Does the PIS include a description of anticipated benefits to subjects or others?

The benefit was completing the data collection was lined with the research purpose and thus participants show that by participating, they would help in achieving the purpose.

17. Does the PIS include information on compensation or reimbursement (for travel costs, etc.)?

No clearly defined compensations were put in place. It is for this reason that <https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

the researcher made personal contact with the participants instead of making participants spend fund to come to researcher.

18. Does the PIS explain how the participant can contact the researcher and the university's Research Participant Advocate? (USA number 001-612-312-1210) or email address liverpoolethics@ohecampus. com).

The contacts of the researcher and University were clearly stated at the end of the PIS

19. Does the PIS include a statement that the participant should keep/print a copy of the PIS?

The PIS was seen as a contract and so participants were made keep their own versions of the contract

20. If anyone is excluded from participating, is their exclusion justified? Is their exclusion handled respectfully and without stigma?

There was a clearly defined exclusion model for participants and so all exclusions were met without sigma.

21. Are adequate measures in place to adequately protect participants from coercion to participate, distress, loss of work/school time, damage to professional reputation, physical/psychological harm, and loss of privacy? Indeed, pragmatic measures were taken in terms of privacy by promoting anonymity of respondents so that there will be no risk to respondents.

22. If vulnerable individuals are included, is their inclusion justified?

There was exclusive use of purposive sampling and so only people who where justified and deserving to provide needed data were included.

23. If the researcher happens to also serve in a trusted or authoritative role to the participant (e. g., health care provider, teacher, etc.), do the recruitment procedures ensure voluntary participation? A researcher with a <https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

dual role must use anonymous surveys or some other method that permits potential participants to opt out without fear of negative consequences.

Patients and students need explicit assurance that their decision about participation will in no way impact their ongoing treatment/studies.

Though purposive sampling was used, this was done with respect to voluntarism whereby no respondent was forced to take part without his or her interest

24. If the research procedures might reveal criminal activity or child/elder abuse that necessitates reporting, are there suitable procedures in place for managing this? Are limits to confidentiality (i. e., duty to report) appropriately mentioned in the participant information sheet?

Anonymity was exclusive with no loopholes as this was not an investigative research.

25. If the research procedures might reveal or create an acute psychological state that necessitates referral, are there suitable procedures in place to manage this situation?

The preamble to the data collection tool contained assurances for respondents, which included psychological assurances that their participation posed no psychological treats to them

#### ETHICS APPROVAL DECISION

THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE POSTED IN THE DISSERTATION CLASSROOM  
AFTER THE DISSERTATION ADVISOR HAS RENDERED A DECISION.

The DA will mark an X next to box A, B, or C and also indicate which subcategory (1, 2, or 3) applies:

<https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>

**A. APPROVED VIA EXPEDITED “ LIGHT TOUCH” ETHICS REVIEW:**

-As the DA, I confirm that all applicable criteria 1-25 above are met with a “yes.”

-I affirm that the researcher accurately responded “ no” to the first set of expedited review checklist items a through k in SECTION 1.

-I affirm that the researcher accurately responded “ yes” to the second set of expedited review checklist items a through f in SECTION 2.

-I affirm that the research activities fall entirely within the parameters of [mark one of the following designs that the Virtual Program Research Ethics Committee has authorized DAs to approve via expedited “ light touch” review]:

1. analyses of public documents, artifacts, behavior, or data;
2. secondary analysis of existing data that is privately held but released for research purposes (with all identifiers removed)
3. surveys or interviews of non-vulnerable adults on non-sensitive topics (i. e., no potential of coercion to participants, distress, loss of work/school time, damage to professional reputation)

**B. REFERRED TO ETHICS COMMITTEE:**

-As the DA, I am referring this study to the full ethics committee (IOREC) because [mark 1, 2, or 3 below]. I will email the student’s ethics application and all attachments as a single zip file to the ethics committee via [liverpoolethics@ohecampus.com](mailto:liverpoolethics@ohecampus.com), copying the the Programme Director (or DOS where the PD role does not exist).

The ethics committee accepts applications until 5 pm Liverpool timezone on the 3rd Thursday of every month. Decisions and feedback will be emailed to the student and DA via email within 5 business days after the 4th Thursday <https://assignbuster.com/ethics-form/>



of the month.

1. the researcher proposes to collect data from vulnerable individuals such as children, prisoners, residents of a facility, students, patients, the researcher's subordinates, mentally/emotionally disabled individuals, economically disadvantaged individuals, non-fluent English speakers, crisis victims, or the elderly

2. some (potential) participants may find the research topic or premise sensitive

3. participants' jobs or livelihoods may be placed at any risk by the study activities

4. the participants' culture and/or international location suggest that extra participant protections may be necessary

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**c. C. REVISIONS REQUIRED:**

-The student needs to revise the proposal and ethics materials to address the concerns in the yellow column and resubmit to me before I can select A or B above.