UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Human Participant Ethics Protocol Submission

CONFIDENTIAL

0 - Identification

RIS Human Protocol Number
35741

Protocol Title
Governance Structures and the Promotion of the Public Interest: Evidence from Brazilian Resource-Scarce Communities

Protocol Type
Investigator Submission

Applicant Information

Applicant Name
Leandro Simoes Pongeluppe

Rank / Position Graduate	**Department / Faculty** N/A
Business Telephone 6476855037	**Extension**

Email Address
leandro.pongeluppe@mail.utoronto.ca

Faculty Sponsor Information

Sponsor Name
Prof Anita McGahan

Rank/Position	**Department** Joseph L. Rotman School of Management - School of Management
Business Telephone 416-978-6188	**Extension**

E-mail
anita.mcgahan@rotman.utoronto.ca

Research Type

Is this course based research? ○ Yes ◉ No

Course Code	Title	Level	Session	Section	Start Date
					30-Nov-02

Division	**Department**	**Unit Head Name**

Collaborators/Co-Investigators

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

Name	Department	Email	Phone	Designation	Alt Contact
Sarah Kaplan	Joseph L. Rotman School of Management	s.kaplan@utoronto.ca	4169787403	Alternate Contact	X

Projected Project Dates

Estimated Start Date
19-Mar-18

Estimated End Date
31-Jan-19

1 - History of the Protocol

Study Status

- ○ Research participants are currently being recruited / participating
- ○ Research participants will be recruited
- ○ Research participant involvement has been completed
- ○ On Hold-Please elaborate in detail
- ● Final Analysis in progress
- ○ This study involves secondary data analysis only

Participant Numbers

Number of participants originally projected	0
How many participants that have completed the study?	400
How many currently are participants?	0
How many participants have withdrawn?	0
How many participants are yet to be recruited?	0

Study Summary

Brief Summary of Study progress, or interim findings over the last 12 months:

The study is currently under revision at the Administrative Science Quarterly journal. Since there is some chance that the editor and referees ask for further analysis and data collection, we would like to renew this protocol until we have further information. Thank you for your understanding.

Recruitment /Data Management:

Any issues or concerns that have been encountered with Recruitment or Data Management

Not applicable. No issues or concerns faced.

Emergent Issues

Ethical Concerns

Since receiving original eithcs approval, have any ethical concerns(Major or Minor) arisen? ○ Yes ● No

Adverse/Unanticipated Events

Have there been any adverse or anticipated event? ○ Yes ● No

Please submit an Adverse/Unanticipated Event Report as soon as possible.

Change in Risk Assessment

Since the last REB review, have there been any changes in your assessment of the risk and the potential benefit of the study based on your findings? ○ Yes ● No

Privacy

In order to fulfil policy requirements, researchers must de-link identifying information, encrypt personally identifiable information and/or allow personnel access to data on need to know basis. Are all these procedures currently in place? ● Yes ○ No

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

2 - Location

Location of the Research: ☐ University of Toronto ☒ Other Locations

Other Location Details

Type	Name	Location	Country	Contact	Email	Description
International	Banco da Providencia	Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	Clarice Linhares	superintendencia@providencia.org.br	

Administrative Approval/Consent

Administrative Approval/Consent Needed: (•) Yes ( ) No

Uploaded Administrative Consent Letters

Document Title	Document Date
Banco da Providencia - Administrative Letter of Consent	2018-01-22

☐ Means of Approval to Follow

Community Based Particatory Research Project? (•) Yes ( ) No

Name of Organization: Banco da Providencia (NGO)

Name of Signatory: Clarice Linhares

Document Title	Document Date
Banco da Providencia Letter of Consent UofT	2018-02-02

Other Ethic Boards Approval(s)

Another Institution or Site involved? ( ) Yes (•) No

3 - Agreements and Reviews

Funding

Project Funded? ( ) Yes (•) No

Explain why no funding is required

The project will occur in partnership with an NGO. No expenses will be executed for its completion. The NGO will benefit from the results as an impact evaluation report on their regular activity. The researchers will benefit with possible academic studies development. All the researcher's work will be pro bono.

Agreements

Funding/non-funding Agreement in Place? ( ) Yes (•) No

Any Team Member Declared Conflict of Interest? ( ) Yes (•) No

Reviews

☒ This research has gone under scholarly review by thesis committee, departmental review committee, peer review committee, or some other equivalent

Type of Review : -e.g.: departmental research committee, supervisor, CIHR, SSHRC, OHTN, etc.

supervisor, committee, and professors from the strategic management department at Rotman

☒ This review was specific to this protocol

☐ The review was part of a larger grant

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

☐ This research will go under scholarly review prior to funding

☐ This review will not go under a scholarly review

4 - Potential Conflicts

Conflict of Interest

Will researchers, research team members, or immediate family members receive any personal benefit? ○ Yes ◉ No

Restrictions on Information

Are there any restrictions regarding access to, or disclosure of information (during or after closure)? ○ Yes ◉ No

Researcher Relationships

Are there any pre-existing relationships between the researchers and the researched? ○ Yes ◉ No

Collaborative Decision Making

Is this a community based project - i.e.: a collaboration between the university and a community group? ◉ Yes ○ No

Collaborative Description

Given the NGO experience in the setting (more than ten years working with these populations). All the decision-making will be discussed and validated by them. The NGO managers already agreed with the procedures suggested so far. Their Consent Letter in included in this protocol.

Terms of reference

Do Terms of Reference Exist? ○ Yes ◉ No

5 - Project Details

Summary

Rationale

Describe the purpose and scholarly rationale for the project

The goal of this research is to examine the performance of public, private (NGO) and hybrid (public-private) governance (Mahoney, McGahan, & Pitelis, 2009; McGahan, Zelner, & Barney, 2013) in a resource-scarce environment (George, McGahan, & Prabhu, 2012).
To date, scholars have called for research on the interaction between business activity and public policy (Mahoney et al., 2009), on the governance of resources in the public interest (Klein, Mahoney, McGahan, & Pitelis, 2010), and on the evolution of capabilities in the public sector (Klein, Mahoney, McGahan, & Pitelis, 2013). One important set of issues in this domain is the relative costs and benefits of different forms of organizational governance structures for deploying resources in the public interest.
Therefore, this research aims to develop an understanding of how different governance structures deploy resources to promote the public interest by comparing a governmental program with a private non-profit program that each seeks to cultivate employment in residents of Brazilian favelas. The goal is to analyze alternatives for commissioning resources under public versus private governance. Specifically, we analyze how governance structure influences both the fulfillment of the public interest and the distribution of value among stakeholders engaged in the deployment.
The research draws on the public-private governance literature (Cabral, Lazzarini, & de Azevedo, 2013; Klein et al., 2010, 2013, 2017; Mahoney et al., 2009; McGahan et al., 2013), which demonstrates that public and private interests are interdependent, and that value creation opportunities and social prosperity depend on the interplay between public versus private governance of capabilities (Mahoney et al., 2009; McGahan et al., 2013). Our contribution is to evaluate the relative social performance and stakeholder implications of alternative governance structures for deploying resources in resource-scarce settings (favelas).
Our approach relies on prior research showing that, on the one hand, public structures may be more resistant than private ones to change in governance. This stability allows for resource development over time under consistent rules. But on the other hand, the renegotiability of private structures may support faster adaptation to enduring changes in the environment in which resources must be deployed. This dynamism may enable private structures to innovate and unlock value more easily (Klein, Mahoney, McGahan, & Pitelis, 2017). As a result, tradeoffs may arise in the efficiency and effectiveness of private versus public governance over resources in various settings. Our analysis also considers the conditions under which hybrid arrangements break these tradeoffs. The study contributes to the public-private literature by illuminating the conditions under which various governance mechanisms organize, redeploy, rearrange and explore resources effectively in the public interest.
The research also dialogues with inclusive innovation literature (George, McGahan, & Prabhu, 2012; Hall, Matos, Sheehan, & Silvestre, 2012; Halme, Lindeman, & Linna, 2012). Inclusive innovation studies evidence how to introduce disfranchised populations in regular market transactions effectively. This literature argues that useful and competitive innovation might be generated in resource-scarce environments, by individuals who have the capabilities to create “something from nothing” (Baker & Nelson, 2005). Therefore, we aim not only to consider how different governance structures generate value in the public interest but also particularly considering, how different governance structures generate value in a resource-constrained environment by improving the socioemotional abilities of treated individuals. Our motivation to consider this contingent setting is that there is widespread agreement that the deployment of resources in this context is unambiguously justified (Baker & Nelson, 2005; George, McGahan, et al., 2012; Halme et al., 2012; Radjou, Prabhu, & Ahuja, 2012).
In the present research, we seek to elucidate the relative effectiveness of a Brazilian national public cash transfer program – Bolsa Familia Program (BFP) http://mds.gov.br/assuntos/bolsa-familia – versus a local program offered by a Brazilian nonprofit foundation – Banco da Providencia (BdP) http://

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen’s Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

www.bancodaprovidencia.org.br/ – dedicated to training low-income residents of Rio de Janeiro's favelas. We compare how the nonprofit organization uses its governance structure to deploy resources/capabilities in the public interest, vis-à-vis what public organizations do acting in the same locality. Favelas are an ideal setting for our purposes. Not only are favelas a resource-scarce environment, but also a significant portion of favela's residents are beneficiaries of BFP (Munk School of Global Affairs, 2016). This setting allows a comparison of how much a nonprofit organization can foster social prosperity – measured by employment and income level increase – among BFP (and also non-BFP) beneficiaries undertaking the training compared to what would have happened to the BFP beneficiaries if they were not exposed to the nonprofit organization's training and coaching program. Also, the research design enables us to understand whether BdP is more effective than their public counterparts on promoting the public interest in these settings.
To answer our research question, we aim to use a mixed-methods approach (Singleton Jr. & Straits, 2009). We will conduct two main studies with this public. First, we will analyze the data from the NGO program results after the completion of the program in 2018. These results will be compared with baseline results of a public national program of cash transfer for the same year. The objective is to evaluate whether public, private or hybrid forms of training generate superior results. Second, will conduct some quantitative analysis using the NGO data, on the project results in previous years. This analysis will help us to understand better whether it is the technical training or the socioemotional training that matters more for the success of the private program. We then turn to a more qualitative approach. We intend to apply a form (Appendix B) with questions on participants objectives regarding the program (income and employment), their personality traits (Researchers & Five, 1990), their perception about their self-efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001), their perception about stereotype (Reuben, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2014) and their level of optimism (Englmaier, 2010). These questions will enable us to verify whether the private program increases not only the technical abilities of the participants but also their confidence level, which leads to a possible superior result. Finally, we will follow-up the results of both studies with interviews with the public and nonprofit staff aiming to understand better how the value is indeed generated in the public interest. These interviews will occur through the internet, telephone and personal communication. We plan to follow a semi-structured approach trying to shed more light on the results of the analysis of both studies.

Methods

Describe formal/informal procedures to be used

Both studies will benefit from a similar methodology of causal inference named LATE (Local Average Treatment Effect). After a brief explanation of each study focus, we describe the details of the method.
Study 1
This study will examine compare the relative effectiveness of a national public cash transfer program – Bolsa Familia Program (BFP) – versus a local program mainly fostered by a Brazilian non-profit foundation – Banco da Providencia (BdP) – dedicated to training low-income residents of Rio de Janeiro's favelas. To analyze this phenomenon, we plan to use data from BFP program (publicly available data by request http://mds.gov.br/assuntos/bolsa-familia/dados/para-pesquisas-e-estudos), and from BdP program, as well as socioeconomic indicators present in the National Social Programs Unified Catalog (Cadastro Unico para Programas Sociais) to perform a comparison across the three types of the governance structure.
Study 2
This study aims to verify whether the private version of the training program contributes more to an improvement on the technical or socioemotional abilities of participants or both. The NGO program has three main phases, each one focusing on one specific capability set, namely: Phase One – Human and Socio-Emotional Capabilities, in which social agents teach human and social rights and develop participants self-confidence, communication skills and proactivity to search for new employment opportunities. This phase lasts for about one month. Phase Two – Technical and Managerial Capabilities, instructors teach general and specific capabilities for 15 different jobs, ranging from textile, electrician, IT to gastronomy, beauty, among others. This phase lasts for about eight months. Finally, Phase Three – Social and Relational Capabilities, in which training is dedicated to increasing capabilities to succeed in the selection process for job positions and to search, find and enroll in a formal job or entrepreneurial activity. This phase lasts for about one month. Family Agency program has two-to-three meetings per week throughout ten months. The program has more than ten years of existence and employment rates after the program is, on average, 60%. Therefore, through the work performed by the NGO with residents of diverse favelas of Rio de Janeiro, we would be able to evaluate the effects of self-efficacy (self-confidence), self-stereotyping (social stigma) and optimism levels of individuals participating in the NGO program on their ability to increase their income level after the program.
METHODOLOGY FOR STUDY 1 AND 2
To evaluate our research question we performed a stratified randomization (Bruhn & McKenzie, 2009; Glennerster & Takavarasha, 2013) comparing the Hybrid Governance Mode (BFP and NGO) with the "Pure" Public Governance Mode (BFP). The procedure is the following; the NGO recruited individuals interested in participating in the training program with the support of two public social service agencies (located in Cidade de Deus and Pavuna, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil). Among those individuals interested in the training program, the NGO selected a total of 288 individuals, who participated in a lottery for a "spot" in the program. These candidates provided basic information on socioeconomic dimensions, with which we executed a stratified randomized assignment (Bruhn & McKenzie, 2009) based on four strata categories: (i) participants' age (median age cutoff), (ii) participants' income level (only social security or more cutoff), (iii) participants' social service agency affiliation, and (iv) participants' preferred training period (morning or afternoon).
Within each stratum, the randomization occurred on March 16th, 2018. All the methodological procedures, as well as the randomization code, were registered in the AEA RCT before the lottery execution (the registry can be found at: <https://www.socialscienceregistry.org/trials/2765/history/26733>) . Half of the members of each stratum were allocated to the NGO treatment (BFP combined with NGO training program) and the other half to the control group (only BFP). This procedure is considered the most adequate for the research objective, given the sample size limitation (Bruhn & McKenzie, 2009). The initial balance of treatment and control have statistically the same composition in all dimensions. Finally, it is important to highlight that we did not re-randomize our treatment assignment because this might increase the final standard errors of our analysis, and resulting in "more harm than good (…) on moderate sized trials" (Bruhn & McKenzie, 2009, p. 210).
After the randomization procedure, the NGO invited all the 288 individuals to come back to the social service agencies they are associated with to perform the initial survey. After the survey, each candidate was told individually whether they "won" the lottery and obtained a spot in the course, or "lost" the lottery and will not be able to attend the training program in 2018. Note that, 66 individuals (23% of the initial sample size) did not show up to perform the initial survey and to learn whether they won the lottery. The rates of not returning were fairly similar between "control" (30 no show) and "treatment" (36 no show) groups. As these individuals did not return before learning their status in the program, i.e. control or treatment, we simply drop them from the analysis pool. As the NGO has a fixed number of spots it needs to enroll per year (n = 120), a backup list, randomly defined during the stratified randomization procedure, was used to "migrate" some participants from the control group to the treatment group. A total of 14 individuals were backed-up from the control to the treatment following the randomly assigned order generated on the lottery day. These individuals were properly informed, and the NGO program then started on April 2nd, 2018.
The final sample size was composed of 100 controls and 122 treated individuals (considering the 14 backed-up individuals). Notice that two additional treated individuals were included to compensate eventual attrition among the treated, as the backup list would not be used after the program began. Historically the NGO reports a 5% to 7% attrition rate in the self-selected participants. According to the NGO managers, these participants usually drop out of the program in the first two weeks, usually because they receive a formal job offer within this period. Similar attrition patterns happen in the randomized module. In total, ten individuals, approximately 8% of the treatment group, dropped-out from the program in the first two weeks (from April 2nd to April 13th, 2018) the majority due to formal job enrollment. Therefore, the final sample, considering the attrition rate, is 100 control and 112 treatment individuals. Based on this final sample size we performed a power analysis. Controlling for other co-variates, the power analysis shows that we will be able to detect the program effect from 0.2 to 0.3 standard deviations, in the best and worst case scenarios, respectively. In other words, we will be able to show that the NGO training program has a causal effect on the considered outcomes if these outcomes increase between 0.2 and 0.3 standard deviations more for treated individuals than controls, comparing before and after the program.
Given the attrition rate of 8% in the treatment, we can argue that the best specification for our analysis would be a Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE)

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

(Angrist & Imbens, 1994; Angrist & Pischke, 2008). The LATE will help us to evaluate and generalize the causal effect of the training program for the "compliers" (the BFP beneficiaries that comply with the assignment Zi to the NGO treatment or control). Notice that LATE use the treatment assignment as an instrumental variable (IV) of the actual treatment Di. For this IV model to hold three mains assumptions are required (Angrist & Imbens, 1994; Angrist & Pischke, 2008), namely: (i) independence, i.e., the treatment assignment must be independent of the outcome and the actual treatment Z_i ? Y_1i,Y_0i,D_1i,D_0i; (ii) exclusion restriction, i.e. the assignment to the training program only affects the outcomes through the actual treatment Y_i (d,0)= Y_i (d,1) ≡ Y_di for d=0,1; and (iii) monotonicity, i.e., there are no "defiers" in program D_1i- D_0i ≥0 ∀ i.
Given the random assignment to treatment performed through the stratified randomization, assumptions (i) and (ii) clearly hold. Concerning assumption (iii), in our particular setting, this assumption is supported by two factors. First, we do not believe anyone would quit their job to enroll in the training program. This is further supported by the fact that the attrition rate occurs because participants go in the opposite direction, leaving the program when they have a chance to get a job right away. Second, the NGO historically knows that people who do not receive their training program do not have alternative options for training. Thus, we consider that LATE assumptions hold in our setting. We can proceed to the description of our analysis model.
Y_i= α_i+ βD_i+ γX_i+ Σ_(g=1)^8 (δS_(i,g)) + ε_i
β= (E(Y_i│Z_i=1)- E(Y_i│Z_i=0))/(E(Y_i│D_i=1)- E(Y_i│D_i=0))
β= E(Y_1i- Y_0i│D_1i ≥D_0i)
In our regression model, Yi is the outcome variable, which will be several different measures, such as: (1) Formal Job Market Measures: (i) wage/income level ? ?; (ii) formal employment ? {0,1}; (iii) informal employment ? {0,1}; (iv) days worked per week ? {0,..,7}; (v) hours worked per day ? {0,..,24}; and (2) Socio-psychological measures: (i) social stigma level (nine questions ranging from ? {0,..,10}); (ii) self-confidence level (eight questions ? {0,..,10}); (iii) optimism level (six questions ranging from ? {0,..,10}).
The questionnaire of socio-psychological measures is presented in APPENDIX A; Di ? {0,1} is the actual treatment; Zi ? {0,1} is the treatment assignment (eligibility for treatment); Σ_(g=1)^8▒〖γS〗_(i,g) is the vector of strata dummies. In total, we have four strata categories, based on the following variables: (i) age (below, or above 35-years old and up), (ii) income (only social security or social security and additional income), (iii) geographical location of the Social Assistance Center (Cidade de Deus or Pavuna), and (iv) chosen training period (morning or afternoon). Xi is a vector of socioeconomic and personality traits control variables. Finally, β is the Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE) of the training program on the compliers (BFP beneficiaries who also performed the NGO training program) for each one of the considered outcomes.
The results will show the incremental effect of the NGO training program for the outcomes of BFP participants, relative to their outcomes if they were only participating in BFP. These findings will enable us to evaluate what extend the combination of a social security program with a NGO training program (hybrid governance mode) increases labor market and socio-psychological outcomes in resource-scarce populations, such as the favela's dwellers, in comparison to "pure" public governance mode.
The NGO will also train in a "Pure" Private Governance Mode (NGO only) approximately 280 additional individuals from other favelas, in no more than four different locations. These individuals will also receive the treatment in 2018. However, these individuals self-selected themselves into the NGO program, i.e., the individuals were enrolled in the program up to the point that there were no more spots available. The assignment rule was based on a "first-in-first-serve" mechanism. Although we cannot make a causal claim based on this, by the end of the intervention, we plan to match (Abadie, Drukker, Herr, & Imbens, 2004) each individual from the "Pure" Private Mode (NGO only) with one in the "Pure" Public Mode (BFP only) to check whether there exist differences among the distinct "Pure" governance modes (BFP vs. NGO), and observe possible differences across the three governance modes.

Copies of questionnaires, interview guided and/or other instruments used

Document Title	Document Date
APPENDIX A - Questionaire on Social Stigma, Self-Confidence and Optimism	2018-04-23

Clinical Trials

Is this a clinical trial? ◯ Yes ◉ No

6 - Participants and Data

Participants and/or Data

What is the anticipated sample size of number of participants in the study? 500

Describe the participants to be recruited, or the individuals about whom personally identifiable information will be collected. List the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where the research involves extraction or collection personally identifiable information, please describe where the information will be obtained, what it will include, and how permission to access said information is being sought.

Study 1 and Study 2
The NGO will recruit about 500 participants from various favelas in Rio de Janeiro city to perform the training program in 2018. We, the research team, performed some ad hoc power analyses considering the clusters in which the training will occur. The analysis indicated that this sample size will have sufficient power to reach significance based on effect sizes found in previous similar studies.
The researchers find important to notice that the NGO already perform internal quality assurance (QA) and quality improvement (QI) program evaluations internally. Therefore, the research mechanism was designed conjointly with the NGO managers to provide them more information about the quality of their program, which might serve as managerial information for the NGO. The research team described this in the project in the "potential benefits" section by declaring that "the result of our studies might inform better the NGO and optimize their results in future years."
Amendment - Feb. 2019
Follow-up with sub-sample from 2018.
The NGO signalized the possibility of performing a follow-up with a representative sub-sample form the 2018 participants in June/July. The idea is to check the "depreciation/appreciation" rates of performance on their income and their perception about the course after some time the program ended. In this case, the sub-sample of participants from 2018 will be recontacted by the NGO social workers, who will basically ask them similar questions that are under the NGO QA/QI. The research team estimates a total of 20~30 individuals that participated in 2018 will take part in the follow-up.
Program Scaling without RCT.
The NGO scaled the partnership with the municipal government from two to six social assistance center. The program will keep operating in the two locations

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

from last year and will include four new locations. The NGO will keep performing their internal quality assurance (QA) and quality improvement (QI) which will be used by the research team as a way to help the NGO to check the quality of their program which now has expanded geographically. This procedure goes in accordance with the TCPS-2, Article 2.5.
Differently from last year, we will NOT randomize the provision of the service at the social assistance center, i.e., all the interested on the program will be inscribed following the NGO regular first come first serve basis. Nevertheless, the research team is interested in evaluating how the program will evolve after this one year partnership. The NGO estimates a total of 80~85 participants per location which will represent a total sample of 500, that is why we kept the same sample size number as this is their limit capacity.
Finally, mind that, the participants from last year, which were in the "control group" have now the preference for a spot in this years' course. This procedure follows the duty of care policy from chapter 11 of TCPS-II and aligns with our initial proposal submission.

Is there any group or individual-level vulnerability related to the research that needs to be mitigated (for example, difficulty understanding consent, history of exploitation by researchers, or power differential between the researcher and the potential participant)? (●) Yes ( ) No

The participants of the NGO program have a low-income, low-education level background. Therefore, the fulfillment of a consent form would be not feasible. We informally agreed with the NGO that they will ask participants form their oral consent before applying the questionnaire. The questionnaire will be then filled by an NGO staff member based on the participant's responses. It worth mentioning that the NGO has a history of more than ten years acting in the favelas and with their residents, which conceives legitimacy to their actions and consequently avoid any possible exploitation in this relationship.
The research team analyzed the NGO claim and validated the applicability of the oral consent in agreement with the "Guide for Informed Consent," as it states in the passage that: "Oral or implied consent are as legitimate as written consent, and in some contexts may even be more appropriate. For example, oral consent may be more appropriate than written consent if literacy, criminality or cultural appropriateness is an issue".
Amendment - Feb. 2019
The targeted group for 2019 has precisely the same socio-economic, socio-psychological characteristics from the one in 2018; the only difference is the geographical location.

Recruitment

Is there recruitment of participant? (●) Yes ( ) No

Recruitment details including how, from where, and by whom

Study on Pure-NGO Governance Mode
We will take advantage of the regular procedure of selection of participants that the NGO already does for their program. The NGO announces in the favelas they have a presence (around six different locations in Rio de Janeiro city) every year from February until March the number of spots in the training course (around 500 spots). In the pure NGO mode, the individuals self-select themselves to participate in the course which starts by the end of March beginning of April. When the demand is higher than the supply of spots, the NGO then randomly define the participants that will be able to enroll in the current year and the ones that will have to enroll in the subsequent year (this happened in the hybrid governance mode, described below). There are only three eligibility criteria regularly used by the NGO. First, the participants have to be above 18 years-old (legal age in Brazil). Second, the participants have to be low-income residents of favelas (the income threshold would be around CAD 30/month). Third, participants have to be a member of a family, i.e., single individuals might not enroll in the program.
Study on Hybrid Governance Mode
In study on Hybrid Governance Mode we will compare the NGO data with the Brazilian national cash transfer program (BFP) data. All Brazilian citizen with kids, and that have monthly per capita income equal or inferior to R$ 80 (about CAD 30) would be eligible for the BFP cash transfers. After localizing these families, municipal governments include them in the National Social Programs Unified Catalog (Cadastro Unico para Programas Sociais) which carries in-depth socioeconomic information as well as a social identification number (NIS) of the family. Cash transfers are made through a national bank named Caixa Economica Federal and are directly transferred to beneficiaries through Bolsa Familia Card, which works like a debit card. Cash transfers are conditional on education performance of family's children and health indicators of vaccination. Municipalities monitor educational and health indicators yearly as well income level of the family to renew the benefits. Also, municipalities work closely with beneficiaries through diverse Reference Center for Social Assistance (CRAS) (Munk School of Global Affairs, 2016).
Nevertheless, this year (2018) the NGO and the Rio de Janeiro municipality developed a partnership to deliver the NGO training program in two governmental Center for Social Assistance (CRAS) – "hybrid" governance mode". In these centers the NGO announced the course to all beneficiaries of Brazilian social security (Bolsa Familia). Then the NGO made a list of all interested, which had 288 individuals. Given the limited number of spots the NGO has for the training program, in consonance with the Brazilian Federal Constitution, the NGO performed a random assignment to the training program. The "lottery" intended to give all participants an equal chance of getting enrolled in the program. Moreover, one member of the research team and the NGO main manager registered a declaration about their legal responsibility with the Brazilian law to guarantee the legality of the randomized procedure. Noticed that the procedure was designed by the NGO with the research team, and approved by the public partner as well as the participants, through their oral consent, which will be described further on this cover letter.

Finally, the research team declared their accordance with the "Duty of Care" policy in trials accordingly to the TCPS-2 Chapter 11 Section A which states that: "researchers do have a duty of care to ensure that the foreseeable risks to participants are justified by the potential benefits, and that the safety of participants is an integral part of the research design and conduct".
It is important to mention that all participants, even those who "lost" the lottery receive the standard of care, i.e., they keep receiving their social security benefit (Bolsa Familia payments from the government). Moreover, as the NGO and the Rio de Janeiro municipality plan to extend the partnership to coming years, these individuals have the real option to enroll in the NGO program next year without participating in a "lottery." Therefore, not only selected individuals are better-off as they receive the standard of care plus the NGO training program in the current year; but also the not selected individuals are equal/better-off as they keep receiving the standard of care, and can enroll directly in the training program next year.
Amendment Feb. 2019
The recruitment process will remain the same as 2019; the only difference is that this year we will not have the random assignemnt ("lottery") for a spot in the course. As the 2018 analysis already shows the impact of the project, the program will go back to the NGO original recruitment style with a first-come-first-serve allocation. The objectives of the researchers will be less to evaluate the impact of the program but understand how the partnership evolved over time and locations.

Is participant observation used? ( ) Yes (●) No

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

Will translation materials be used/required? (•) Yes ( ) No

Description of translation materials

The only material that will be translated is the Questionnaire on Self-Efficacy, Optimism, Stereotype and Big 5 Personality Traits (APPENDIX A). The instrument has been already translated and validated with the NGO, whose managers helped the formulation of the questions aiming to support a better understanding of the respondents. All other materials will be databases, which will be described subsequently in this protocol.
Moreover, the NGO declared that they would include the questions present on the questionnaire on Self-Efficacy, Optimism, Stereotype and Big 5 Personality Traits (APPENDIX A) as part of their QA/QI indicators from the present year on. Therefore, we consider that all data in the present study can be classified as secondary data accordingly to the definition present on TCPS-2 Article 2.5 and Section D of Chapter 5, in particular, Article 5.5.(a) to (f) and Article 5.5.B.

Attach copies of all recruitment posters, flyers, letters, email text, or telephone scripts

Document Title	Document Date
Not Applicable	

Compensation

Will the participants receive compensation? ( ) Yes (•) No

Non Compensation Description

The NGO training program is free of costs for participants. Also, the participants have an intrinsic benefit on enrolling on it. The historical data shows that at least

Is there a withdrawal clause in the research procedure? (•) Yes ( ) No

Is compensation affected when a participant withdraws?

Participants are free to withdraw from the research and from the NGO program at any time without penalty. Given the characteristics of the population, they do not have a written contract with the NGO, but the oral agreement established by both parts guarantees this procedure. It is important to highlight that the NGO has more than ten years of experience working with these populations.

7 - Investigator Experience

Investigator Experience with this type of research

Please provide a brief description of the previous experience for this type of research by the applicant, the research team, and any persons who will have direct contact with the applicants. If there is no previous experience, how will the applicant and research team be prepared?

Leandro Pongeluppe is a Ph.D. student at the Rotman School of Management. Leandro has experience in socio-environmental impact measurement and public service innovation. He worked for at least seven years as a researcher at a Brazilian university named Insper. One of his main activities was managing research on education at low-income populations. Only with favelas populations, Leandro was three years of experience researching favelas in Sao Paulo (such as, for example, Paraisopolis, Heliopolis, Marcondes favelas) and Rio de Janeiro (such as, for example, Rocinha and Serrinha favelas). Also, Leandro lived form about a month in Favela da Rocinha (Rio de Janeiro) collaborating with a social project named "Inova Urbis."
Dr. Anita McGahan is a Professor of Strategic Management at Rotman (with a cross-appointment to the Munk School of Global Affairs). Her research is focused on industry change, sustainable competitive advantage and the establishment of new fields. An area of particular interest to her is in global health and the diffusion of knowledge across international boundaries. Dr. McGahan is familiar with research in developing countries and especially on public-private interactions and inclusive innovation/poverty alleviation topics.

Are community members collecting and/or analyzing data? (•) Yes ( ) No

Please describe the community members research team status (eg. employees, volunteers, or participants). What training will they received?

The NGO team, which is composed of social workers from the localities, will be in charge of data collection for the project. This team has been trained both in universities and by the NGO to perform this activity in favela's locations. Moreover, these social workers are formally employed at the NGO and already perform this type of tas on their regular operations. Therefore, as the NGO has all the know-how to access these localities and gather information, the research team will rely on their experienced team to perform this activity.

8 - Possible Risks and Benefits

Possible Risks

Potential Risk Details:

Physical Risks ( ) Yes (•) No

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

Psychological/emotional Risks ◉ Yes ○ No
Social Risk ○ Yes ◉ No
Legal Risk ○ Yes ◉ No

Risk Description

Study 2
Psychological/emotional risks
The “Questionnaire on Self-Efficacy, Optimism, Stereotype and Big 5 Personality Traits” (APPENDIX A)
The questionnaire asks some questions about self-confidence and Stereotype based on individuals place of residence and the fact that they might be recipients of national conditional cash transfer. We understand that some of the questions might embarrass or upset the respondents. Therefore, we dialogued with the NGO, who has a better experience in dealing with these populations to understand whether they evaluate a potential psychological/emotional risk in this activity. Accordingly, to their response, the questionnaire will not classify as a potential risk because during the program they ask this questions (not in a questionnaire form) during the Phase One – Human and Socio-Emotional Capabilities, of the program. Accordingly to the NGO managers, this phase is dedicated to explain and empower individuals towards their human and social rights. At this moment social agents aim to foster participants self-confidence, communication skills and proactivity to search for new employment opportunities. Therefore, topics related to self-efficacy, optimism, stereotype are discussed aiming to socioemotionally support the participants.
In any case, a form of minimizing any potential risk is to allow the individuals not to answer the question. Therefore, we included an N/A (“I do not want to respond this question”) category on the Likert scale of the questionnaire. Therefore, any participant that feels uncomfortable with the question have the right not to respond it.

Potential Benefits

Benefit Description

Participants: Participants will be able to understand better their capabilities to access the regular job market. Also, the training combined with the research will shed more light on which aspects of the training are more decisive on the success of the participants. Finally, the result of the NGO training is usually a superior

9 - Consent

Consent Process Details

The participants of the NGO program have a low-income, low-education level background. Therefore, the fulfillment of a consent form would be not feasible. The NGO managers explained to us that all the consent and enrollment procedures to their program are informally agreed with the participants in oral terms. The oral consent: (i) increase participants trustworthiness with the NGO. Accordingly to the NGO managers, this population is usually low literate and sometimes formal consents, which require signature, can be interpreted as traps/scams. In this sense, oral consent not only helps participants to increase their trust level concerning the NGO but also reduce their fear of being trapped; (ii) increase participants believe that they can withdraw the program at any point in time. The NGO reports that participants have the right to withdraw the program whenever they want, as we described in the withdraw section. In this case, the oral consent helps to reassure participants that they will not have any legal impediments on withdrawing; and (iii) is socially accepted as a better way to deal with the communities. The NGO managers explained that because of the institutional complexity of the settings, oral consent is historically and socially seen as a more acceptable option than a formal consent. Moreover, the NGO managers stressed the importance to keep the oral consent instead of a formal one, as a way to keep their social reputation in the locations and with the communities which was developed throughout more than 10 years of operation.
The research team analyzed the NGO claim and validated the applicability of the oral consent in agreement with the “Guide for Informed Consent,” as it states in the passage that: “Oral or implied consent are as legitimate as written consent, and in some contexts may even be more appropriate. For example, oral consent may be more appropriate than written consent if literacy, criminality or cultural appropriateness is an issue”.
Therefore, for our study, we will follow the NGO experienced advise. The NGO staff will ask participants form their oral consent before applying the questionnaire developed by the researchers (Appendix A). In this situation, the NGO staff will explain that the questionnaire was designed to understand better their personality traits. Also, they will explain that the questionnaire will be used as a source of information for their Phase One - Human and Socio-Emotional Capabilities section of the training program.
The questionnaires will be then filled by an NGO staff member based on the participant’s responses. The participants are totally free to withdrawal the questionnaire response at any moment, and if they do not want to answer a particular question, they can also express it.
It worth mentioning that the NGO has a history of more than ten years acting in the favelas and with their residents, which conceives legitimacy and trust from the participants towards their actions. Moreover, the NGO consent to perform the research is included in the NGO's letter of consent.
Finally, the research team would like to reinforce that that our research is composed of secondary non-identifiable data, which will exempt us from participant consent accordingly to TPCS Article 5.5.B. Nevertheless, the research team aligned the steps with the NGO about the oral consent from the participants about the collection, use, and research use of their data in a non-identifiable way. NGO staff agreed with this suggestion and proceeded as previously described.

Uploaded letter/consent form(s)

Document Title	Document Date
Not Applicable	

Is there additional documentation regarding consent such as screening materials, introductory letters etc.: ○ Yes ◉ No

Uploaded letter/consent form(s)

Will any information collected in the screening process - prior to full informed consent to participate in the study - be retained for those who are later excluded or refuse to participate in the study? ○ Yes ◉ No

Is the research taking place within a community or organization which requires formal consent be sought prior to the involvement of the individual participants ○ Yes ◉ No

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen’s Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

Are any participants not capable (e.g.: children) of giving competent consent? ◯ Yes ◉ No

10 - Debriefing and Dissemination

DeBrief

Will deception or intentional non disclosure be used? ◯ Yes ◉ No

Will a written debrief be used? ◯ Yes ◉ No

Do participants/communities have the right to withdraw their data following the debrief? ◉ Yes ◯ No

Withdrawal Process Details

Participants will be free to withdraw their data following the oral debriefing. The procedure will be the following. The social workers will describe the NGO project and if participants were interested they can subscribe to it. During this subscription, the social workers will ask regular questions the NGO uses to check whether the individual classifies for the project and will also ask the questions from APPENDIX A. The participants will be previously informed that they can not answer or simply withdraw their answers at any time of the program.

Information Feed Back Details following completion of a participants participation in the project

NGO: We agreed to forward to the NGO all the results of the research. Also, this material will be transformed into an executive report which will be used by the NGO as a communication piece. Also, in person presentation sessions will be performed to explain the results and indicate the main findings in a more executive (non-academic) way.
Participants: We agreed with the NGO to perform presentations with the participants of the training program informing them about the results of the project. For these sessions, in person presentation will be performed to explain the results and indicate the main findings in a more informal way aiming to inform the participants better avoiding any possible misunderstanding from their part due to academic or executive jargon.

Procedural details which allow participants to withdraw from the project

Participants of the NGO training program can withdraw at any point in time. The NGO staff told us that historically, participants inform the NGO staff about their withdrawal, but they not even need to do that. Accordingly to the NGO managers, given the informality of the setting, withdraw is totally open.
Also, regarding the questionnaire (Appendix A), individuals are free to withdrawal responding the questionnaire by raising their hands at any point of the questionnaire completion.
Both the NGO and the researchers want to support this population in their development, so we believe they must have total freedom on the withdraw decision.

☐ Not Applicable

What happens to a participants data and any known consequences related to the removal of said participant

If the participant chooses to withdraw, the participant's data will be destroyed by the researcher and the participant will be informed about it. There will be no other consequences for the participant.

☐ Not Applicable

List reasons why a participant can not withdraw from the project (either at all or after a certain period of time)

☒ Not Applicable

11 - Confidentiality and Privacy

Confidentiality

Is the data confidential? ◉ Yes ◯ No

Will the confidentiality of the participants and/or informants be protected? ◉ Yes ◯ No

List confidentiality protection procedures

All data gathered during this research is anonymized by through the use of anonymous user identification numbers (this procedure has already been agreed with the NGO managers). Moreover, performance will remain confidential to other participants of the training program as well, which avoid any problem related to social comparison.
More importantly, the research team ensure that U of T Data Security Standards will be followed properly. This include the use of (i) a secure server environment, (ii) password protected computers, and (iii) data encryption.
Finally, the researchers agree with TCPS-2 Article 5.5.B, declared in the "confidentiality and privacy" section of the protocol that all "data gathered during this research is anonymized by through the use of anonymous user identification numbers". These data will be provided by the NGO to the research team in a way to guarantee the privacy of participants.

Are there any limitations on the protection of participant confidentiality? ◯ Yes ◉ No

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

Is participant anonymity/confidentiality not applicable to this research project? ◯ Yes ◉ No

Data Protection

Describe how the data (including written records, video/audio recordings, artifacts and questionnaires) will be protected during the conduct of the research and subsequent dissemination of results

We plan to store data behind a firewall on our password-protected computers in password-protected spreadsheets in order to safeguard individual privacy. The NGO already performs this procedure with their historical data.

Explain for how long, where and what format (identifiable, de-identified) data will be retained. Provide details of their destruction and/or continued storage. Provide a justification if you intend to store identifiable data for an indefinite length of time. If regulatory requirements for data retention exists, please explain.

Data samples will be stored indefinitely on the researchers' personal computers in the manner described above. We justify indefinite storage by noting that no part of our privacy protection will be loosened at the conclusion of this research.

Will the data be shared with other researchers or users? ◯ Yes ◉ No

12 - Level of Risk and Research Ethics Board

Level of Risk for the Project

Group Vulnerability: Medium

Research Risk: Low

Risk Level: 1

Explanation/Justification

Explanation/Justification detail for the group vulnerabilty and research risk listed above

We believe that our research is minimal risk. We consider a medium level of pre-existing vulnerabilities in this group given their unfavorable socio-economic position at the beginning of the NGO training project. However, we consider the research risk is low not affecting negatively the participants in any aspect. Moreover, the NGO appreciation of the materials developed by the research team signalized the low risk inherent in the research procedures.
The research team declared their accordance with the "Duty of Care" policy in trials accordingly to the TCPS-2 Chapter 11 Section A which states that: "researchers do have a duty of care to ensure that the foreseeable risks to participants are justified by the potential benefits, and that the safety of participants is an integral part of the research design and conduct".
It is important to mention that all participants, even those who "lost" the lottery receive the standard of care, i.e., they keep receiving their social security benefit (Bolsa Familia payments from the government). Moreover, as the NGO and the Rio de Janeiro municipality plan to extend the partnership to coming years, these individuals have the real option to enroll in the NGO program next year without participating in a "lottery." Therefore, not only selected individuals are better-off as they receive the standard of care plus the NGO training program in the current year; but also the not selected individuals are equal/better-off as they keep receiving the standard of care, and can enroll directly in the training program next year.

Research Ethics Board

REB Associated with this project: Social Sciences, Humanities & Education

13 - Application Documents Summary

Uploaded Documents

Document Title	Document Date
Cover Letter with Responses to Reviewer	2018-06-25
Banco da Providencia - Administrative Letter of Consent	2018-01-22
Banco da Providencia Letter of Consent UofT	2018-02-02
APPENDIX A - Questionaire on Social Stigma, Self-Confidence and Optimism	2018-04-23

14 - Applicant Undertaking

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

I confirm that I am aware of, understand, and will comply with all relevant laws governing the collection and use of personal identifiable information is research. I understand that for research involving extraction or collection of personally identifiable information, provincial, federal, and/or international laws may apply and that any apparent mishandling of said personally identifiable information, must be reported to the office of research ethics.

As the Principal Investigator of the project, I confirm that I will ensure that all procedures performed in accordance with all relevant university, provincial, national, and/or international policies and regulations that govern research with human participants. I understand that if there is any significant deviation in the project as originally approved, I must submit an amendment to the Research Ethics Board for approval prior to implementing any change.

☒ I have read and agree to the above conditions

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

RIS Protocol Number: 35741

Approval Date: 21-Dec-21

PI Name: Leandro Simoes Pongeluppe

Division Name:

Dear Leandro Simoes Pongeluppe:

Re: Your research protocol application entitled, "Governance Structures and the Promotion of the Public Interest: Evidence from Brazilian Resource-Scarce Communities"

The Social Sciences, Humanities & Education REB has conducted a Delegated review of your application and has granted approval to the attached protocol for the period 2021-12-21 to 2023-01-10.

If this research involves face-to-face (F2F) in person research, please note that REB approval alone is not sufficient to commence research. You must wait for an approval letter from the F2F COVID-19 Review Committee. The approval letter will be sent to the Principal Investigator's email address once the Committee has deemed the F2F in-person research ready to start.

Please be reminded of the following points:

- An **Amendment** must be submitted to the REB for any proposed changes to the approved protocol. The amended protocol must be reviewed and approved by the REB prior to implementation of the changes.
- An annual **Renewal** must be submitted for ongoing research. Renewals should be submitted between 15 and 30 days prior to the current expiry date.
- A **Protocol Deviation Report** (PDR) should be submitted when there is any departure from the REB-approved ethics review application form that has occurred without prior approval from the REB (e.g., changes to the study procedures, consent process, data protection measures). The submission of this form does not necessarily indicate wrong-doing; however follow-up procedures may be required.
- An **Adverse Events Report (AER)** must be submitted when adverse or unanticipated events occur to participants in the course of the research process.
- A **Protocol Completion Report** (PCR) is required when research using the protocol has been completed. For ongoing research, a PCR on the protocol will be required after 7 years, (Original and 6 Renewals). A continuation of work beyond 7 years will require the creation of a new protocol.
- If your research is funded by a third party, please contact the assigned Research Funding Officer in Research Services to ensure that your funds are released.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your research.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics