

WriteWell: Effects and mechanisms of different ways of writing about distressing events

No registrations found.

Ethical review	Not applicable
Status	Pending
Health condition type	-
Study type	Interventional

Summary

ID

NL-OMON24066

Source

NTR

Brief title

TBA

Health condition

Not applicable

Sponsors and support

Primary sponsor: Not applicable

Source(s) of monetary or material Support: Not applicable

Intervention

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

MHC-SF (general wellbeing)

DASS-21 (depression, anxiety, stress)

RRS (rumination)

IES-R (posttraumatic stress)

Secondary outcome

Not applicable

Study description

Background summary

(prolonged exposure, writing therapy, Narrative Exposure Therapy) differ in the fact that they require the exposure to take place in the present versus past tense. The efficacy of imaginal exposure in the present versus past tense has never been subjected to a direct experimental comparison however. An additional unanswered question is if the effects of imaginal exposure can be explained by increased coherence of the memories that are the subject of the exposure. This study addresses these questions, as well as the role of a number of potential moderators and mediators, in a non-clinical sample. Imaginal exposure is conducted using writing assignments according to the Pennebaker writing paradigm. Experimental study arms include written imaginal exposure in the present tense and in the past tense, and are compared to a no-intervention control condition (of note, this type of control condition is not offered in the forced-choice 'Control group' field below, therefore we selected 'unknown' there).

Study objective

- (1) Written imaginal exposure results in beneficial effects compared to no-intervention
- (2) Beneficial effects are greater for written imaginal exposure in the past tense than for written imaginal exposure in the present tense

Study design

Baseline (T1), 3 weeks (1 week after writing intervention, T2), six weeks (4 weeks after writing intervention)

Intervention

4 30' writing sessions (present tense or past tense) in the course of 2 weeks

Contacts

Public

University of Amsterdam
Arnold van Emmerik

+31-(0)20-5256810

Scientific

University of Amsterdam
Arnold van Emmerik

+31-(0)20-5256810

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

Age 18 or older; sufficient fluency in Dutch to complete the study procedures

Exclusion criteria

Not applicable

Study design

Design

Study type:	Interventional
Intervention model:	Parallel
Allocation:	Randomized controlled trial
Masking:	Open (masking not used)
Control:	N/A , unknown

Recruitment

NL	
Recruitment status:	Pending
Start date (anticipated):	29-04-2021
Enrollment:	105

Type: Anticipated

IPD sharing statement

Plan to share IPD: Undecided

Plan description

Not planned yet, but the informed consent allows for the sharing of anonymous data.

Ethics review

Not applicable

Application type: Not applicable

Study registrations

Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

In other registers

Register ID

NTR-new NL9446

Other Ethics Review Board, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam; Social and Societal Ethics Committee, Leuven University : 2020-CP-12895 (University of Amsterdam); G-2020-2713 (Leuven University)

Study results