

St. Norbert College
IRB Application: New Study
Research Involving *Human* Subjects

Part I: Project Cover Sheet

Instructions. Please type your responses directly into the gray boxes. Be sure to save a copy of the completed application.

- *Faculty and staff members or students conducting independent research projects.* Completed IRB applications and accompanying materials should be submitted via email to irb@snc.edu.
- *Students conducting course-related research projects.* Completed IRB applications and accompanying materials should be submitted via email to both irb@snc.edu and stuart.korshavn@snc.edu (reviewer of student course-related research).

Other inquiries can be directed to David J. Bailey, Ph.D., Associate Provost, and Chair, SNC Institutional Review Board, Gehl-Mulva Science Center, Room 2055A; St. Norbert College; 100 Grant Street; De Pere WI 54115. Phone inquiries can be made at (920)403-3242.

A. Basic Project Information

Study Title: Playing videogames cooperatively reduces race-related prejudice

Date Submitted: October 1, 2021

B. Principal Investigator(s) (PI)

Name(s): Taylor Smith and Jordan Jones

Program/ Unit: Psychology

Institution: St. Norbert College

City, State, Zip: De Pere, WI 54301

Phone: (920)403-3184 Fax: () - Email: taylor.smith@snc.edu

C. Principal Investigator Status

SNC Faculty Member
X SNC Student

SNC Administrator/Staff Member
 Guest or Other

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Application Number _____

St. Norbert College
IRB Application: New Study
Research Involving *Human* Subjects

Page 2
(Rev. 09/28/2021)

D. SNC Supervisor/Collaborator (to be completed if PI is a student or guest)

Name: Pat Brown

Phone: (920)403-3184

Email: pat.brown@snc.edu

Program/Administrative unit: Psychology

Course discipline, number, and name, if applicable: PSYC 301, Research Methods

Part II: Project Description Checklist

Instructions For each item in sections A, B, and C of Part II, please check the box (labeled either “Yes” or “No”) that best describes the features of your project

A. Participants, Selection, Recruitment, Incentives, etc.
 (address items you marked ‘yes’ in Part III :B)

Does your research involve:	Yes	No
1. Use of participants who are 0-6 years of age?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
2. Use of participants who are 7-17 years of age?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
3. Use of participants who are members of a vulnerable population not mentioned above and/or judged to have limited freedom of consent (e.g., prisoners, economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, those with mental or emotional disorders, pregnant women, non-English speakers, elderly, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
4. Use of participants with whom the researcher has another relationship (e.g., administrator-teacher, teacher-student, psychotherapist-client, supervisor-employee, nurse-patient, professional-client, parole officer-parolee)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
5. Access to participants through cooperating institutions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
6. Use of advertisements, letters, announcements, etc, to recruit participants?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Compensation of participants (e.g., incentive, payment, course credit, etc.)?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Penalties or other disadvantages for those declining to participate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

B. Anonymity, Privacy, Confidentiality
 (address items you marked ‘yes’ in Part III:C)

Does your research involve:	Yes	No
9. Access to health care, legal, or educational records?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
10. Collection of potentially sensitive information about participants (e.g., family income, illegal or unethical behavior, health/medical history or practices)?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Videotaping or audiotaping participants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
12. Collection of information that identifies or potentially identifies individual participants through surveys, interviews, or tests (including demographic data)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
13. Use of archival data containing identifying information or codes that could link individuals to the data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

St. Norbert College
IRB Application: New Study
 Research Involving *Human* Subjects

14. Gathering or recording information in such a manner that participants can be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to them? Yes No

C. Risks to Participants

(address items you marked 'yes' in Part III:D)

- | Does your research involve: | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 15. Use of instructional strategies that are NOT commonly used and well accepted, or the addition of assessment procedures that are NOT routinely used in established or commonly accepted educational settings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Observation of children (0-17 years of age), where the observer will participate in the activities being observed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Survey or interview procedures with children (0-17 years of age)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Inclusion of questions about topics that the participant might consider sensitive or personal (e.g., questions about ethical or religious beliefs, questions about relationships, questions about health status, health practices, or medical history, etc.). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Placing the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damaging the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation if their responses were to be disclosed outside of the research project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Deception of participants regarding the purposes of the study, procedures, or the meaning of their behavior, performance, or findings? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. Any procedures that could impose stress or expose participants to risks beyond what they encounter in everyday life? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. Use or presentation of materials that might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Risk of physical injury or discomfort to participants, including physical exertion beyond normal activity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Manipulation of physiological requirements (nutrition, sleep, etc.) or of ethically sensitive psychological and social variables (sensory deprivation, isolation, stress, self-esteem)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Participants taking internally, or having applied externally, any substances, drugs, or other controlled substances? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Collection and/or removal of any fluids or tissue from participants? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Part III: Project Description Narrative

A. Purpose and Significance of the Project

- **Explain** the goals and/or hypotheses of this research project, indicating how your goals relate to previous research in this area.

Intergroup relations can be marked by conflict. People tend to stereotype, prejudge, and discriminate on the basis of group membership. Given the harm that results from intergroup conflict, from stereotyping, prejudging and discriminating, psychologists, and other social scientists, have looked for factors that reduce conflict. Four conditions are necessary to reduce conflict between members of different groups when they are in contact with one another (Forsyth, 2014). First, all members should be equal in social status. They should be working toward a common goal of interest to both groups. Achieving the goal should require members to work cooperatively with one another and to depend on one another. Finally, social norms should support and encourage cooperation.

Close, cooperative contact between members of different groups reduces intergroup conflict in a number of ways (Forsyth, 2014). First, competition increases tension and promotes intergroup conflict. Cooperation, on the other hand, decreases tension and promotes harmony. Intergroup conflict is accompanied by categorical thinking, ingroup versus outgroup, “us versus them.” Cooperation promotes recategorization. Members of different groups come to see one another as members of a common group. Finally, members of groups in conflict learn to respond negatively toward those in the outgroup. Cooperative tasks offer opportunities to learn to respond positively toward those belonging to a different group. Recreation provides a context for beneficial intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Members of different groups share information about themselves, discover similarities between themselves and others, work together to complete projects, and play games together.

Videogames, particularly multiplayer games, are becoming increasingly popular recreational activities (Greitemeyer and Cox, 2013). Some games can be played in both solo and team mode. In team mode players must cooperate because goals are positively linked. One player can achieve her or his goal only if other players also achieve their goals. In team mode players can play with partners in the same room, or, via the internet, with unseen partners at distant locations. As a result videogames provide a means by which to test, under controlled laboratory conditions, the effect of cooperation on attitudes and subsequent behavior (Adachi, Hodson, & Hoffarth, 2015). Playing videogames cooperatively has been shown to produce a number of benefits, at least in the short term. Cooperating with a partner while playing a videogame increases cooperation with that same partner on a later mixed motive task (Greitemeyer & Cox, 2013). Cooperation with a different person, who was not the game partner, is also increased by playing a videogame cooperatively (Greitemeyer, Traut-Mattausch, & Osswald, 2012). The benefits of cooperative game play are of particular interest when the players belong to different groups. Playing a videogame cooperatively with a partner believed to belong to an outgroup increases cooperation with that outgroup partner on a later mixed motive task

(Velez, Mahood, Ewoldsen, & Moyer-Gusé, 2014). Cooperating with a partner believed to belong to an outgroup also increases positive attitudes and behavior towards the partner and the group to which the partner is thought to belong (Adachi, Hodson, Willoughby, Blank, & Ha, 2016; Adachi, Hodson, Willoughby, & Zanette, 2015).

Playing a videogame cooperatively has been shown to produce a variety of benefits, but research on the effects of intergroup cooperative play has considered relatively inconsequential group differences, that is, students at rival universities. This investigation will examine the effect of cooperative videogame play on a potentially more contentious group distinction, the distinction between white and black college students in the United States. This investigation will determine if white participants who play a videogame cooperatively with a black confederate will report less animosity towards blacks in general and behave more positively toward the black confederate than will white participants who play the videogame by themselves. To test this prediction, this investigation will rely, in part, on the procedure developed and reported by Adachi et al. (2016).

Adachi, P. J. C., Hodson, G., & Hoffarth, M. R. (2015). Video game play and intergroup relations: Real world implications for prejudice and discrimination. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 25(Part B), 227-236. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2015.09.008

Adachi, P. J. C., Hodson, G., Willoughby, T., Blank, C., & Ha, A. (2016). From outgroups to allied forces: Effect of intergroup cooperation in violent and nonviolent video games on boosting favorable outgroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(3), 259-265. doi:10.1037/xge0000145

Adachi, P. J. C., Hodson, G., Willoughby, T., & Zanette, S. (2015). Brothers and sisters in arms: Intergroup cooperation in a violent shooter game can reduce intergroup bias. *Psychology of Violence*, 5(4), 455-462. doi:10.1037/a0037407

Forsyth, D. (2014). *Group dynamics* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Greitemeyer, T., & Cox, C. (2013). There's no "I" in team: Effects of cooperative video games on cooperative behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 224-228. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1940

Greitemeyer, T., Traut-Mattausch, E., & Osswald, S. (2012). How to ameliorate negative effects of violent video games on cooperation: Play it cooperatively in a team. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 1465-1470. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.03.009

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Velez, J. A., Mahood, C., Ewoldsen, D. R., & Moyer-Gusé, E. (2014). Ingroup versus outgroup conflict in the context of violent video game play: The effect of cooperation on increased helping and

decreased aggression. *Communication Research*, 41, 607-626. doi:10.1177/0093650212456202

B. Participants in the Project

- **Identify** all participant groups (e.g., teachers, elementary school students, college students, administrators, clients, patients, etc.)

- **Describe**, for each,
 - the basic characteristics of potential participants (e.g., anticipated number of participants, age range, gender, racial/ethnic background),
 - any special criteria for including or excluding individuals from participation, and,
 - any procedures used to identify, recruit, or compensate participants.

St. Norbert College undergraduates will be recruited to participate in this investigation. Volunteers will be male and female white young adults between the ages of 18 and 22. Because this is a study of the effects of inter-racial cooperation on white race-related prejudice only white volunteers will be recruited. Volunteers will be recruited through the College's Interdisciplinary Research Participation Pool (SONA). Volunteers will receive course credit for participating.

- If you checked yes to items 1, 2, 3, and/or 4 in **Part II, A. Participants, etc.** above, please **justify** the inclusion of the vulnerable population(s) used in the proposed research.

Volunteers will not be purposefully recruited from any vulnerable population

C. Sources of Data, Procedures, Methodology

- **Describe** the methodology, procedures, and persons responsible for gathering, storing, and data in the project.
- **Describe** what each group of participants will be asked to do (including any interventions or educational programs, and all testing, observation, interviewing, or laboratory procedures).

Participants will be tested individually. When they arrive the researcher will engage them in small talk while they wait for "the other participant" to arrive. A confederate of the same sex will arrive a few moments later. The confederates, one female and one male, are both Black, both nineteen years old, and both experienced videogame players. They are students at a nearby university and have never visited campus before, minimizing the likelihood that participants will recognize them or know them. The confederates are personable and will engage the participants in brief conversations about major and home town as they take their seat. The participant and the confederate will be told they are participating in a study of opinions: (a) opinions about videogames, (b) opinions about social issues, and (c) opinions about movies. Participants will read and sign a

statement of consent.

Participants will be randomly assigned to play a videogame either alone or with the confederate. To minimize suspicion, participants will choose one of two folded slips of paper in a rigged drawing believing they are determining whether they and the confederate would play alone or together. To minimize suspicion further, in the cooperative condition the confederate will choose one of two other folded slips of paper, supposedly to determine if the participant and confederate will play on the same or different teams. The confederate will always announce that the two will play on the same team. All participants will play NBA 2K18 (a basketball game) on an XBOX 360 console. They will play as members of the Golden State Warriors in a game against the Cleveland Cavaliers. Adachi et al. (2016) had participants play an earlier edition of the same game either solo or cooperatively. The investigator will introduce the game and demonstrate basic functions. All participants will be told that the goal of the game is to help their team win. The participant and confederate will then be escorted to separate cubicles to play the game. In the solo condition confederates will see only their own player on screen. In the cooperative condition participants will see both their own and the confederate's players on screen, both members of the same team, but they will not be able to communicate with the confederate. The two game consoles will be linked online via XBOXLive when playing cooperatively. Confederates will often help participants in the course of playing the game. Participants will play the game for 12 minutes. To maintain the deception that the study is interested in opinions about videogames, once the game is concluded, participants will complete a 12 item questionnaire about their opinions of NBA 2K18 while alone in their cubicles. The questionnaire will contain two manipulation check questions: *Did you play the game alone or with another person?* and *If you played with another person, were the two of you on the same team or on different teams?*

While still alone in their cubicles, participants will complete, under the guise of a measure of opinions about social issues, a measure of race-related attitudes, *The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale* (Henry & Sears, 2002). The scale includes eight items, some of which are reversed scored, and makes use of a variety of response scales to minimize bias and general mindless response patterns. Among the items are: "It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites" and "Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve." Overall scores range from 0 to 1, with higher scores reflecting greater racial animosity. To minimize demand characteristics the 8 items related to race will be embedded among 16 similar items related to sexism (Swim & Cohen, 1997) and homophobia (Wright, Adams, & Bernat, 1999). Only the eight items related to race will be scored.

Finally, purportedly as part of the opinions about movies task, participants will complete a measure of pro-outgroup behavior. They will be told that both they and the confederate, who had either been a partner or merely a fellow participant, will watch clips from a movie and give their opinions about the movie. Ostensibly to prevent people from choosing for themselves the kinds of movies they like to watch, each of them will be choosing the movie for the other to watch and rate. Participants will be told that neither can influence the other's selection. Movie titles will not be provided. Rather, participants will choose to have the confederate watch clips from an unnamed movie that allegedly elicits positive emotions (happy/pleasant, coded as 1), one that elicits neutral

emotions (coded as 0), or one that elicits negative emotions (sad/unpleasant, coded as -1). A higher score reflects choosing a more positive/favorable outcome for a member of an outgroup (the Black confederate). Adachi et al. (2016) used the same measure of pro-outgroup participant behavior. After participants choose a collection of movie clips for the confederate they will be debriefed. Care will be taken to probe for suspicion, particularly about the study's purpose and the confederate. Information about the true purpose of the study and the two measures, symbolic racism and pro-outgroup behavior, will be shared sensitively lest participants feel they will be judged by their responses. Participants will be reminded that their responses are completely anonymous. Following debriefing the participants will be thanked and dismissed.

The applicants named on this application will be responsible for conducting all research sessions, administering all research tasks, collecting all data, scoring all questionnaires, entering all data, and analyzing all data. All data will be stored on a laptop computer that is password protected. No individually identifying data will be included in the data file.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology*, 23, 253-283.

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism Scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 103-118. <https://doi-org.snc.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x>

Wright, L. W., Jr., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21(4), 337-347. <https://doi-org.snc.idm.oclc.org/10.1023/A:1022172816258>

D. Risks to Participants and Benefits of Participation

- **Discuss** any physical, psychological, social/economic, or legal risks (including, but not limited to, those listed in **Part II. C. Risks to Participants** for which you checked "Yes") that might result from participation in this research and the likelihood and seriousness of these risks.
- **Explain** why exposure to such risks is necessary, and describe actions that will be taken to minimize the risk(s).
Describe any potential benefits of participation (to participants, to society, and/or to a particular field of study) and evaluate the risk-benefit ratio of participation in the project.

White participants will be asked to report their attitudes towards Blacks. Race-related prejudice is a sensitive topic. Participants may feel some discomfort responding to some of the questions. Their responses will be completely anonymous. A unique participant identification number will be issued to each volunteer so as to be able to link together the various forms they complete during the study session. The participant identification number will not be linked in any way to any

personally identifying information.

Participants will benefit by learning about psychological research and the beneficial effects of inter-group cooperation on prejudice.

- If you checked “Yes” to “Deception of participants...” in section **Part II. C. Risks to Participants** **explain** why the deception is necessary and describe procedures for debriefing participants.

Participants will be actively misled. They will be told the investigation is concerned with opinions when in fact it is concerned with prejudice reduction. Participants will be led to believe that the second person participating in the research session is a volunteer when that person is in fact a confederate of the investigator. They will be told the questionnaire measures opinions about social issues when in fact it measures race-related prejudice. They will be told they are choosing a collection of movie clips for someone else to watch when in fact their prosocial behavior is being measured.

Deception is necessary given the sensitive nature of race-related attitudes and the tendency for people to respond in socially desirable ways when asked about such attitudes.

Debriefing will be sensitive and thorough. To begin, participants will be invited to ask their own questions about the study.

Volunteers will then be asked about particular aspects of the study. What do they think of the other “participant” (did he or she seem nice; in the cooperative play condition, did he or she seem to be a good video game player; do they have any other comments on the other “participant”). What do they think of the social opinions questionnaire (were the issues it addressed important; did it overlook important issues; do they have any other comments on the questionnaire).

Volunteers will then be told that things are not always as they seem in psychology experiments. They will be told the other “participant” was actually assisting the researchers and it was not a coincidence that he or she was Black. Volunteers will be told that the research is assessing the effect of playing a video game with a Black partner on race related attitudes. They will be told that some of the items on the social opinion questionnaire measure race related attitudes.

The hypothesis will be briefly explained and the theory and research supporting the hypothesis will be briefly summarized.

Volunteers will be assured of their anonymity. They will be told researchers will not know who completed a questionnaire when they score it. They will receive an information sheet about the study at the conclusion of debriefing.

E. Consent to Participate

St. Norbert College
IRB Application: New Study
Research Involving *Human* Subjects

-
- **Describe** the process involved in obtaining consent (e.g., when, where, and by whom consent will be secured, how information about the study will be communicated, etc.) and
 - **Describe** the procedures for ensuring that this consent is informed and voluntary (particularly if the study is characterized by use of vulnerable populations or use of deception).

Volunteers will sign a printed consent statement at the beginning of the research session. They will be told that they will play and evaluate a video game, they will give their opinions on contemporary social issues, and they will choose among three sets of movie clips. All of this is true.

Part IV: Attachment Checklist
(Have you attached appropriate supporting documentation?)

A. All applications must include the following documentation	Check if Attached
---	--------------------------

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Certificate/documentation of having completed required Human Subject Ethics Tutorial (e.g., IH, CITI, etc.). | X |
| 2. Copies of data collection instruments (written questionnaires, interview questions, instructions to participants, observational coding sheets, data sheets, etc.) | X |

B. All applications must include appropriate consent document(s)	Check if attached	Check if Not Applicable
---	--------------------------	--------------------------------

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. A copy of the written consent form signed by adult participants and/or by their legal guardians or representatives (if participants are less than 18 years old) | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. A copy of the written assent form signed by participants between the ages 7 and 17 | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 5. A copy of the cover letter that accompanies the confidential or anonymous survey(s) used in the study, indicating that completing and returning the survey will be deemed "consent". (The cover letter should also include all content required of informed consent statements) | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 6. A copy of the transcript of any oral presentation used in the place of a written consent statement, accompanied by the statement which participants or legal representatives, and an auditor-witness sign indicating their agreement to participate in the study described orally. | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 7. A request for waiver or modification of the typical consent procedures outlined above, with appropriate rationale and justification, because typical consent procedures would adversely affect the experimental design or procurement of data. | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

C. One or more may be required. If your study ...	Check if Attached	Check if Not Applicable
--	--------------------------	--------------------------------

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. ... has a Principal Investigator (PI) who is NOT an SNC employee or student, please attach a copy of the IRB application submitted to the PI's sponsoring institution (and the IRB's response, if available). | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 9. ...draws participants from a cooperating institution or institutions, please provide documentation of approval to do so from the institution(s). | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 10. ...uses advertisements, letters, or announcements, etc. to recruit participants, please attach copies of these. | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. ...involves access to health care, legal, or educational records, please provide documentation of approval to access these records. | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 12. ...involves use of archival data, and these are not publicly available, please provide documentation of your authorization to access and use these data. | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 13. ... involves use of deception, please attach a copy of the debriefing protocol or materials. | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. ...involves use of audio or videotaping of participants, please attach a separate consent form to be signed by participants, identifying the recording medium and describing the disposition of recordings after completion of the project. | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

Part V: How Will My Proposal be Reviewed?

All proposals will be reviewed by the IRB. However, some categories of research *may*, under certain circumstances, be exempt from the need for review by the *full* IRB. Please check *all categories that apply to your research*: My research project can be described as...

1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal education practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

NOTES: Research in this category may include minors. In order for research of this type to be considered exempt from review by the full IRB, the researcher(s) must provide a letter from the appropriate institutional official documenting that all educational interventions and assessment procedures employed in the research are part of the typical educational curriculum and that the researcher(s) have permission to access test data and records that will be used in the research project.

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior.

3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior wherein (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

NOTES: Please note that in order for research in this category to be considered exempt from review by the full IRB, all data, documents, records, or specimens to be used in the research must be in existence at the time of IRB review and must have been collected for purposes other than the proposed research. If the archival data being used is not public record, the researcher(s) must have a letter from the appropriate official giving the researcher(s) permission to use the data archive and verifying that the data released to the researcher(s) will contain no identifying information or code.

5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under these programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

NOTE: If you checked one or more of the above AND you checked NO to all items in Part II of this application, your research may need to be reviewed only by the IRB Chair or designee.

Research projects characterized by use of vulnerable populations (see Part II A), by threats to participants' anonymity, confidentiality, or privacy (see Part II B), by exposure of participants to more than minimal risk (see Part II C), and/or research NOT falling into the categories listed above, may require review by the full IRB.