

IRB #: PRO-FY2019-596

Title: Comparison of Aggression in Writing Assignments and Student Responses

Creation Date: 4-24-2019

Status: **Awaiting Certification**

Principal Investigator: Jasmine Ross

## Section 1 Investigator Information

Human Research Protections Program  
Institutional Review Board

---

### Principal Investigator

---

- 1 Name: Jasmine Ross  
Organization: Users loaded with unmatched Organization affiliation.  
Address: , Memphis, TN 38152-3370  
Phone:  
Email: jsross5@memphis.edu

### 1a Your UofM Appointment Status

---

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Student
- Staff

Other

2 Do you have a Co-PI or Co-PIs?

---

Yes

No

### Faculty Advisor

---

2 **Name:** Katherine Fredlund  
**Organization:** College of Arts and Sciences  
**Address:**  
**Phone:**  
**Email:** kfrdlund@memphis.edu

### Primary Contact

---

3 **Name:** Jasmine Ross  
**Organization:** Users loaded with unmatched Organization affiliation.  
**Address:** , Memphis, TN 38152-3370  
**Phone:**  
**Email:** jsross5@memphis.edu

### Co-Investigators

---

4

Use the text area for investigators outside UofM, and use the Find People button below for UofM investigators.

Please choose your UofM investigator(s) here:

---

5 Is there a financial sponsor for this study?

---

Yes

No

#### Determination

Do you need a determination for whether or not your study is human subjects research requiring IRB review?

---

6 *Human subject* means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or identifiable private information.

*Research* means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

Yes. Proceed to determination questions for submission

No. Proceed with your protocol submission

### CITI Training Completion Information

---

- 6 CITI (**C**ollaborative **I**nstitutional **T**raining **I**nitiative at the University of Miami) Training in human subjects research is required every two years.

Date of completion:

03/23/2019

### CITI Modules Completed

---

Check all that apply.

Social & Behavioral Research Investigators

Bio medical Research

Students conducting no more than minimal risk research

IRB Members

Nursing

CITI Record ID:

---

30996611

### 6 Anticipated number of subjects for the entire project.

---

18

### 7 Submission type

---

✓ Exempt study

Secondary Analysis of Existing Data

All other studies

#### Purpose of the study

---

a) **Study Goal.** Provide a concise statement of the study hypothesis(es) or goal(s).

b) **Literature review.** Briefly describe how the pertinent body of literature supports the study goal. Include citations and references.

c) **Citations and references.** Include citations and a complete reference section.

d) **Possible contribution.** Describe the potential benefits of the proposed research study to the literature.

A) STUDY GOAL: I am seeking to understand the influences of an instructor's semantics (i.e. word choices) on a student's semantics.

STUDY HYPOTHESIS: A student's semantics in their writing assignments is influenced in a positively correlating way by the semantics in the writing prompts they are given. In other words, the more aggressive the language in the writing prompt, the more aggressive their response will be.

STUDY EXPLANATION: My interest is in the levels of aggression in written language, which can be determined through imperative commands, violent word choices, and active (rather than passive) voice. Semantics is just one element of communication; for the purpose of this study, I choose to focus on how word choices, specifically, are influential; other elements that may have influence are tone, syntax (sentence structure), and pragmatics (context).

I believe that aggression in written language is a worthwhile field of study because how intentions, emotions, and evaluations are communicated through word choice, and interpreting aggression in

word choice can reveal significant information about how people in general impart said information. Furthermore, aggression and violence in written language are growing in interest in writing studies research; topics such as gender differences, multilingual and bilingual differences, and psychological roots are growing fields (Composition Studies). Researchers are becoming more involved with how hidden feelings are communicated to others, especially negative feelings such as anger, resentment, and even those of violence or threats of violence.

#### B) LITERATURE REVIEW:

Some background information that may be important for understanding my research is that aggression is a topic that is still growing. Most articles I have read in preparation for this proposal are mainly aimed at studying aggression in young people; for example, many researchers are interested in knowing how aggressive tendencies in written language begin in childhood and progress into adolescence. I believe it is just as important to know how aggression in written language can be influenced in older ages, particularly in college and university ages (i.e. young adulthood). Another area of study is in gender differences, in which researchers study how men and women communicate aggression in written language (Communication Studies). I am less interested in studying gender differences and more interested in understanding teacher-student relationships. In all of the articles I read, I could not find many that were specifically about how aggression is communicated in written assignments. I will disseminate the articles that I did find in order of publication; most of these were more focused on aggression in general rather than the written language.

In 2001, Scott Myers and Kelly Rocca published a research article concerning how college students reacted to aggression on the part of their professors. The study found that a professor's argumentativeness, a form of aggression which implies confidence in one's beliefs and passion for one's values, actually motivated students to learn more and be more interested in the class. Furthermore, professor argumentativeness did not cause students to believe the climate of the classroom had changed, nor did they become more apprehensive about going to and/or participating in the class. I did not find significant information in this article about semantics in order to answer my research question (Myers, 2001).

In 2012, Alan Goodboy and Scott Myers published a research article that described how college students' aggressiveness was related to the amount of times they expressed disagreement with their professor. The article found that college students were more likely to disagree with their professor if they exhibited higher levels of aggression. However, the article also concluded that personality characteristics (that is, a student's base level of aggression or argumentativeness) was more influential on their likelihood to disagree in the classroom. I did not find information in this article that positively linked teacher aggression with student aggression (Goodboy, 2012).

In 2013, Darren Linvill and Joseph Mazer published a research article about perceived instructor aggression in a college classroom. This article was based on the indication that most American college students believe that their professors hold political biases and that they allow these biases to influence their teaching methods beyond acceptability. This would be a form of aggression because it is an assertive display of one's beliefs and values, which has the implied suggestion that one's students should also hold these beliefs, or that there may be implied consequences for disagreeing with them. The researchers' results explained that students are more likely to perceive biases in their instructors if they (the students) had a higher base level of aggression (that is, aggression innate to their personalities). However, I did not find that this article discussed word choices thoroughly enough for me to glean much information about how the professor's semantics might influence the students' semantics (Linvill, 2013).

What I can conclude from the articles I have read is that researchers currently understand that aggression in students can influence perceptions of the instructor and the classroom. Researchers

also found that argumentativeness (a specific form of aggression) in instructors is linked to positive student motivation. But there are significant gaps in this research. I do not think aggression in classrooms has been studied enough to determine a link between professor aggression and student aggression. Thus, I have enough of a textual basis to support the continuation of my research proposal.

I intend to fill this research gap with the following research question, which I have formed from careful examination of my literature review and from my own research interests: Does the level of aggression in an instructor's semantics (word choices) influence a student's semantics, and if so, in what ways?

#### C) CITATIONS AND REFERENCES:

*Composition Studies*. Homepage. Retrieved April 29, 2019, from <https://www.uc.edu/journals/composition-studies.ht...>

Goodboy, A. K., & Myers, S. A. (2012). Instructional Dissent as an Expression of Students Verbal Aggressiveness and Argumentativeness Traits. *Communication Education*, 61(4), 448-458. doi:10.1080/03634523.2012.699635

Harkins, J., & Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Language: A key issue in emotion research. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 10(4), 319-331. doi:10.1080/13511610.1997.9968537

Infante, D. A. (1995). Teaching students to understand and control verbal aggression. *Communication Education*, 44(1), 51-63. doi:10.1080/03634529509378997

Linvill, D. L., & Mazer, J. P. (2013). The Role of Student Aggressive Communication Traits in the Perception of Instructor Ideological Bias in the Classroom. *Communication Education*, 62(1), 48-60. doi:10.1080/03634523.2012.721889

Myers, S. A., & Rocca, K. A. (2001). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in the college classroom: Effects on student perceptions of climate, apprehension, and state motivation. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65(2), 113-137. doi:10.1080/10570310109374696

#### D) POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTION:

Aggression in instructors such as teachers and professors in education systems is a crucial area of study because the ways that aggression is communicated to students are, theoretically, ways that students can absorb and learn into their communicative methods. Instructors can act as mentors who essentially transfer their communicative methods to their students, which may influence them far beyond their times at school and college (Harkins, 1997). I believe that it is vital to understand how these forms of aggression in written language are conveyed in the classroom so that instructors can be aware of their influence upon their students and so that students can instead learn to communicate in productive, negotiating, and empathetic ways. Controlling aggression is an important developmental step in building higher level social skills (Infante, 1995). Lastly, eliminating aggressive written language in classrooms is just one step toward communication methods that are both peaceful and successful, thus leading toward a more empathetic and understanding world.

## Methods and Procedures

---

**a) Study design.** Provide a summary statement of the design methodology used. For example, stating that the study is a randomized clinical trial using a double blind procedure with a placebo control. Another example would be a reanalysis of de-identified archival data.

**b) Materials.** Provide a concise description of all special equipment, instruments, or measures in this section. Also, label and attach copies of data collection tools at the end of this Initial Review Request.

**c) Procedures.** Provide a chronological description of the experience of being a participant in this study. For archival data, describe how the data is secured, stored, and used. Include the process by which consent will be obtained.

**d) Indicate which procedures and treatments are associated with the present study and those which are not part of the study (i.e., pre-existing programs, interventions, or classroom exercises).**

A) STUDY DESIGN: This study uses a critical discourse analysis methodology because it examines instructor assignments and student writing responses for the purpose of determining the existence of larger trends of aggression in institutional academic assignments. The method is a combination of textual analysis, which is systematic examination of patterns in documents, and experimental research, which is a quantitative method that keeps variables constant in order to find shifts in a measured variable (in this case, aggressive written language is the variable to be measured). The quantitative process begins as follows. Writing assignments are systematically analyzed for levels of aggression in their semantics. This is done by:

1. Coding all words in the assignments in scaled categories such as “calm” to “aggressive,” “peaceful” to “violent,” and “passive” to “active;”
2. ranking the assignments on a “calm” to “aggressive” scale based on their quantitative aggression levels; and
3. coding the assignments into categories based on difficulty (at least a 5-point scale from “least difficult” to “most difficult”).

B) MATERIALS: This study will require the use of a computer to store data. Data will be stored, ordered, and analyzed with the Microsoft Excel software program. No other materials or equipment will be used.

C) PROCEDURES: 1. Experiment is conducted as follows. Over a single semester:

- 1.a) 1/3 of students in an undergraduate class will receive writing assignments in increasingly aggressive order;
- 1.b) 1/3 will receive assignments in the opposite direction, in decreasingly aggressive order; and
- 1.c) the remaining 1/3 will be a control group and receive assignments in a randomized order of aggression.
2. All assignments will be given in levels of (appropriately) increasing difficulty over time, and will be suitable for the course level.
3. The students’ responses will be collected and evaluated in a similar way as the prompts; they will be coded for levels of aggression using scaled categories.
4. The responses will be measured in levels of aggression over time (the course of the semester) to determine if there is a positive correlation.

Data will be secured by collecting all written assignments given over a semester along with each student’s correlated responses to these assignments. Data will be stored in digital copies on a secure network at the primary investigator’s residence. Data will be used only for the research purposes. No data will be published with student names or other identifying factors. Consent will be

obtained through a standard informed consent form; the research will not be conducted unless all students provide express consent by signing the form.

D) PROCEDURES AND TREATMENTS: Procedures and treatments not part of this study include regular college classroom activities, such as class discussions, forum posts, and assignments not requiring written language (e.g. group activities).

## Attachments: Instruments and Measures

---

### Secondary analysis of existing data

---

The specific information is necessary when identifiable data about human subjects will be obtained. Data are identifiable if they include direct or indirect identifiers such as name, email address, UID Number, race, gender, nationality, age etc.

a) List source of the data and an explanation of why the data were originally collected.

b) Describe in detail the data you plan to access and analyze.

10 c) Indicate the requirements of the data supplier and how access to the data will be granted or obtained. If access to the data is governed by a data use agreement, provide a copy of the agreement.

d) Describe procedures that will protect data you are given access.

A) Data collected about the students will include their names and their level of college completed (e.g. freshman, sophomore, etc.). No other data will be necessary for this study. No identifying data will be published.

B) Data to be analyzed is obtained from online-only undergraduate level English and Language Arts classes at the University of Memphis. The data will be in the form of written assignments given by the instructor and students' responses.

C) Data will be obtained directly from the students who sign the consent form.

D) Procedures to protect the data will be a locked home computer on a secure personal network behind a firewall.

Data information: Data Use Agreement, Data Sharing Agreement, Variables List etc.

---

### Investigator Qualifications

---

a) Describe the research team's qualifications and experience pertinent to conducting this research project. This description must address and include information about the lead investigator and, if the lead investigator is a student, the faculty advisor as well.

11

b) If physical or psychological assessments are being administered who will administer the assessment and score the results and what are their qualifications for doing so? Is the training in human subject protection of those administering assessments adequate?

A) Lead investigator is a first-year graduate student and has no prior experience in conducting or publishing research. Lead investigator has completed basic IRB training. Faculty advisor is a published researcher in the fields of writing studies, pedagogy, rhetorics, and composition.

B) N/A

## Human Subjects

---

**a) Characteristics.** Describe the characteristics of the participant population. Include the age range(s), gender, ethnicity, health status, any physical, mental, cognitive or emotional limitations, and any other relevant variables.

**b) Vulnerable Populations.** Indicate if subjects include students, prisoners, pregnant women or any other class of subjects that might be especially vulnerable and require special consideration.

**c) Pre-existing relationship** to subject pool. If subjects are students, describe the relationship between students and researcher. If there is a pre-existing relationship between the researcher and the subject pool, please describe that relationship in detail.

**d) Selection.** Describe criteria for inclusion and exclusion of subjects in the study.

Provide a detailed explanation for each exclusion and inclusion criterion.

**e) Justification** for the proposed sample size. This number helps reviewers understand the expected sample size. Please explain why this number was chosen for your sample size. Any increases to sample size require a modification to the study.

A) Characteristics of the population will be: Median age range of approximately 18-22; unspecified gender; unspecified ethnicity; unspecified health status.

B) N/A -- No vulnerable populations will be included.

C) N/A -- No pre-existing relationship exists.

D) Only criterion for selection is that the subjects are all in the same online undergraduate English or Language Arts class. This criterion was chosen because I believe my research into written aggressive language can best be discovered at an early stage of institutional education. Undergraduate classes will be within the students' early exposure to college-level writing assignments.

E) My sample size of 18 was chosen because that is the approximate amount of students who will be taking a single online class in English or Language Arts at the University of Memphis.

12

## Recruitment

---

- 13 Describe how subjects will be identified and recruited.  
Provide detailed description and examples, where relevant, of any material to be presented to potential participants prior to their receipt of the informed consent/assent documents.

Subjects will be identified based solely on their election to attend an online English or Language Arts undergraduate course at the University of Memphis. I will request consent from all students in the class before my study begins. No material will be presented to the students prior to their receiving the informed consent forms. There will be no recruitment materials used.

## Recruitment Materials

---

Attach advertisements, postings on social media, posters, scripts for radio/TV, other electronic ads, scripts for verbal recruitment, copies of email recruitments and any text that will be provided to potential participants. It should be clear in all recruitment materials that you are conducting research. See Sample Recruitment flyer on [IRB website](#).

Sample documents: [sample\\_recruitment\\_flyer.doc](#)

## Subject Compensation

---

- 14 a) Describe any economic or other incentives for participation including reimbursement for time and travel.  
b) If study participation requires subject to complete multiple sessions, compensation must be pro-rated over the course of the study. (Example: In a study where subjects are compensated \$50 per session, Tom completes only two sessions, then he should be compensated \$100 for his participation)  
c) If the study incentive involves earning course credit, list alternative ways to earn the same credit.

N/A -- Students will not be compensated for this research.

## Risk Benefit Analysis

---

### Potential Risks

---

- a) Describe all potential risks: physical, psychological, social, legal or other associated with each procedure. Assess the probability, severity, potential duration and reversibility of each risk.
- b) Identify those risks that are minimal and those which are more than minimal.
- c) Describe the procedures used to minimize any potential risks.
- 15 A) There is no more than minimal risk for participating in this study. It is highly improbable that the data I collect will be leaked or stolen because I use strict firewalls and store my data behind multiple passwords.
- B) The only data that will be collected is students' written responses to assignments; all identifying factors will be removed from this data for publication, but the only potential risk is that, before removal of these identifications, these written responses will be discovered by someone outside the research team and connected to the students. A consequence of this might be that a student wrote about something personal in their life that they did not want to be revealed or discovered outside of their classroom setting.
- C) The procedure to minimize this risk is stated above; all of my data will be stored securely behind multiple levels of passwords and firewalls.

### Potential Benefits

---

- a) Describe the direct potential benefits to the subject. If there are none, this should be so stated.
- b) Describe the potential societal benefits of the study in terms of human health/welfare, the advancement of knowledge or the good of society.
- 16 A) There are no benefits to the subject. No evaluations or results will be given directly to the subjects.
- B) Potential societal benefits are an increase in empathy in institutional academic settings, as any trends of aggression I find in writing assignments given by instructors could be used to determine larger societal and institutional aggression trends. Naturally, an increase in empathetic written communication is beneficial to society because young adults will learn to communicate more effectively and with more concern for how others perceive their writing. Additionally, given the lack of research in this particular field, I believe that knowledge of aggression patterns in writing studies may be significantly advanced.

### Differential Evaluation of Risks and Benefits

---

17

Justify the research study based on your evaluation of the risk/benefit assessment. When composing this section, imagine you are standing in front of a panel of researchers who are all skeptical about your research. Your task is to reassure them that the benefits of your research outweigh the risks.

I believe that finding patterns of aggression in academic instructors, which could potentially influence young adults who are seeking education, is an overlooked area of research which desperately needs to be discussed. Even written forms of aggression could possibly have strong effects on how students write and communicate with others. Nowadays especially, written communication is vital in both professional settings and personal relationships. That is why it is necessary to learn how aggression is taught, even unknowingly, to college students.

## Privacy

---

The research proposal should outline strategies to protect privacy, including how the investigator will access participant information.

In developing strategies for the protection of subjects' privacy, consideration should be given to:

- The methods used to identify and contact potential subjects.
- The settings in which an individual will be interacting with an investigator.
- The appropriateness of all personnel present for research activities.
- The methods used to obtain information about subjects.
- The nature of the requested information.
- Information that is obtained about individuals other than the target subjects, and whether such individuals meet the regulatory definition of human subject (e.g., a subject provides information about a family member for a survey).
- Privacy guidelines developed by relevant professional associations and scholarly disciplines.
- How to access the minimum amount of information necessary to complete the study.

18

Subjects will be contacted only through email. They will be found by contacting the instructor of the class and asking through them to contact the students for the study.

Setting will be purely virtual.

Research activities will be conducted solely on a computer, and so personnel (besides the lead investigator) are not necessary.

Method used will be only gathering subject information directly from the professor and the students.

Nature of the information is simply their names and their educational progress (sophomore, etc.).

This is only to ensure different assignment responses are able to be differentiated and to analyze

patterns over time.

If a subject provides information about other individuals in their writing responses, I will be sure to remove any identifying factors from publication. I will do this because it is not possible to determine if these subjects are okay with having information about them published.

The following standard University of Memphis privacy guideline will be used: "Individuals and organizations that monitor this research may be permitted access to inspect the research records. This monitoring may include access to private information and the writings collected as part of this study. These individual and organization include the University of Memphis Institutional Review Board."

The minimum necessary information, which is a simple collection of student names and their level of college progression, will be collected through the professor and by the students themselves when they complete the consent form.

## Confidentiality

---

The research proposal should outline in detail what variables of identifiable data will be handled, the strategies to maintain confidentiality of identifiable data, including controls on storage, handling, sharing of data as well as eventual destruction of identifiable data including signed consent forms.

19 **NOTE:** If using an online survey like Qualtrics, Survey Monkey, etc., change settings to Anonymize Responses so IP addresses will not be collected. The Qualtrics default is to collect IP address and GPS coordinates of respondents. By setting the survey to Anonymized Responses the investigator will not be collecting this identifiable information. Include this language in the Confidentiality, Methods/Procedures, and in any other necessary sections/documents noting that the investigators will set Qualtrics to Anonymize Responses.

Variables of the identifiable data will be handled as follows:

1. Names and college progression levels will be assigned only to differentiate between writing responses.
2. To maintain confidentiality, data will be stored only on a single computer with secure firewalls and passwords on a personal network.
3. Data will be shared only with the faculty advisor unless required to share with the institution.
4. All data containing identifying information will be deleted permanently from the personal network and the computer on which it was stored.

## Collaboration, Engagement & Sponsor Relationships

---

- 20
- a) Describe all collaborative relationships necessary to complete your research. Include letters of support from the collaborator(s). This letter must come from a person with director-level authority within the collaborating institution. When the collaborator has an Institutional Review Board, please include a copy of the IRB application sent to collaborating institution.
  - b) Indicate in your study when U of M IRB approval must be issued before the collaborator will commit to the study.
  - c) Specify what data will be provided to the collaborator(s) and sponsor(s).
- N/A

### Collaboration Attachments

---

Letters of support, IRB approvals / protocols from collaborating institutions

### Proposal

---

- 21
- If your study is sponsored, please insert or attach a copy of the funded proposal under this section.
- N/A

**Full Board** and **Expedited** review-categorized research require informed consent for human subjects to participate in research. Such consent must be given by the subject and parent/guardian if the subject is under the age of eighteen (18) years. Voluntary and fully informed consent must be obtained and documented in writing unless a waiver is requested and granted.

[Also, templates/guidelines for Informed Consent, Parental Consent, and Children's Assent forms are available on the IRB website.](#)

**EXEMPT** review-categorized research also requires obtaining voluntary consent to participate. This consent will provide subjects with pertinent information such as stating that the activity involves research and the University of Memphis has approved the research. Also, as is appropriate, include information such as contact for investigators, description of the procedures, risks and benefits, and IRB contact information.

### **WAIVERS:**

#### **WAIVER OF DOCUMENTATION OF INFORMED CONSENT**

##### **45 CFR 46.117(c)**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) may consider waiving the requirement for obtaining documentation of informed consent if the following conditions are met. To request a waiver, justification for the waiver should be included in the IRB submission and should address each of the criteria listed below.

1. IRB may waive requirement to obtain a signed consent form for some or all of subjects if:  
a. the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be harm resulting from breach of confidentiality; each subject must be asked whether subject wants documentation;

**OR**

b. the research presents no more than minimal risk and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required.

2. In cases where documentation is waived, the IRB may require investigator to provide subjects with written statement regarding the research.

*[Note that 1a above is not included in FDA. 1b is included in FDA and HHS regulations 21 CFR 56.109(c)]*

## **WAIVER OF INFORMED CONSENT\***

### **THESE CRITERIA DO NOT APPLY IF THE STUDY IS FDA REGULATED\*\***

#### **45 CFR 46.116 [d]**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) may consider waiving the requirement for obtaining informed consent if all of the following conditions are met. To request a waiver, justification for the waiver should be included in the IRB submission and should address each of the criteria listed below.

#### **1. THE RESEARCH INVOLVES MINIMAL RISK TO SUBJECTS**

This condition is satisfied if either the likelihood or the magnitude of harm/discomfort is no greater than what the subjects would ordinarily encounter in daily life or during routine clinical care.

#### **2. THE WAIVER OR ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE RIGHTS AND WELFARE OF THE SUBJECTS**

The IRB will assess whether subjects' rights, such as the "right to privacy", would be violated if the consent were waived. *For example, in the case of "right to privacy", the IRB will consider the safeguards for minimizing the potential invasion of privacy and will consider the potential benefits of participation.*

#### **3. THE RESEARCH COULD NOT PRACTICABLY BE CARRIED OUT WITHOUT THE WAIVER;**

##### **AND**

For example, obtaining informed consent would not be practicable if the investigator will have no direct contact with subjects and will not know their identities.

#### **4. WHENEVER APPROPRIATE, THE SUBJECTS WILL BE PROVIDED WITH ADDITIONAL PERTINENT INFORMATION AFTER THEY HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY**

In social science research involving deception, it is common practice to debrief the subjects at the conclusion of the study. In other studies, however, it would not be appropriate to require debriefing. For example, if the research proposed collection of tissue without identifiers, it would not be possible for the investigator to provide additional information since the identities of the subjects would be unknown.

*\* To conduct research involving deception or passive consent procedures, these criteria must be met.*

*\*\* Waiver of Consent in FDA regulated studies is permissible only in life-threatening situations or acute care research if specific FDA mandated requirements are met.*

Even if all of the above conditions are met, the IRB is authorized to require an investigator to obtain informed consent. For example, the IRB may determine that the knowledge being sought is not important enough to justify the use of unaware subjects.

---

### Consent Documents

---

Attach Consent, Assent, Parental/Guardian permission, Waiver requests (Waiver of written documentation of informed consent, Waiver of informed consent)

[RossJasmine\\_InformedConsent.docx](#)

Consent statement (for exempt research), or waiver requests can go here

---

If you have nothing to add here, please type n/a.

N/A

Additional questions or concerns can be addressed to either [irb@memphis.edu](mailto:irb@memphis.edu) or by calling (901) 678-2705.

Any additional attachments can be added below:

---

Additional Attachments

---



## Section 6 Investigator Contingency Response

When submitting your revisions to a protocol, inform the IRB how you addressed each of the contingencies for the previous version of the submission. Copy and paste the last issued contingency list in a Word document and include your response and related section/question directly underneath each respective contingency.

This document can be attached as an MS Word or a PDF file. You can also copy and paste your contingency response in the text box. See sample document below.

---

Add or attach your completed **Investigator Contingency Response** document. If you have nothing to add in the text box below, please type "N/A".

---

Copy and paste document content here:

N/A

Or attach document here:

---

Sample documents: [Example - Investigator Contingency Response.docx](#)