General Information

1. General Information

1. Project Title

   Pluralistic Ignorance in the Classroom

2. **Brief Summary**. Provide a **brief non-technical description** of the study, which will be used in IRB documentation as a description of the study. Typical summaries are 50-100 words. Please reply to each item below, retaining the subheading labels already in place, so that reviewers can readily identify the content. PLEASE NOTE: THIS SECTION MAY BE EDITED BY THE IRB FOR CLARITY OR LENGTH.

   Purpose: To understand how students' misperception of their peers' study habits can influence their academic performance.

   Participants: The study's participants will be student volunteers from Social Psychology (PSYC 260) and Abnormal Psychology (PSYC 245) at UNC-Chapel Hill.

   Procedures (methods): This study will be conducted online, using the Poll Everywhere classroom response software system (PollEverywhere.com). Volunteer student participants will first be consented online via PollEverywhere.com. They will be told that their participation will have no bearing on their standing in the class. Then they will be asked four successive questions about their preparation for an upcoming exam and their perception of their peers' preparation for the same exam. Because our hypothesis involves exam performance, participants will be fully debriefed as to the nature of the study after the exam is completed.

3. Is this new study similar or related to an application already approved by a UNC-Chapel Hill IRB? Knowing this will help the IRB in reviewing your new study.

   No

2. Project Personnel

1. Will this project be led by a STUDENT (undergraduate, graduate) or TRAINEE (resident, fellow, postdoc), working in fulfillment of requirements for a University course, program or fellowship?

   No

2. List all project personnel beginning with principal investigator, followed by faculty advisor, co-investigators, study coordinators, and anyone else who has contact with subjects or identifiable data from subjects.

   - List ONLY those personnel for whom this IRB will be responsible; do NOT include collaborators who will remain under the oversight of another IRB **for this study**.
   - If this is Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) or you are otherwise working with community partners (who are not functioning as researchers), you may not be required to list them here as project personnel; consult with your IRB.
   - If your extended research team includes multiple individuals with limited roles, you may not be required to list them here as project personnel; consult with your IRB.

   The table below will access campus directory information; if you do not find your name, your directory listing may need to be updated.
   If a change to the Principal Investigator is requested during the course of the study, a PI Change Form must be submitted.

Liaison	Last Name	First Name	Department Name	Role	Detail
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH)					
	Buzinski	Steven	Psychology	Principal Investigator	view

	Clark	Jenna	Psychology	Co-investigator	view
	Cohen	Matthew	Psychology	Co-investigator	view

NOTE: The IRB database will link automatically to UNC Human Research Ethics Training database and the UNC Conflict of Interest (COI) database. Once the study is certified by the PI, all personnel listed (for whom we have email addresses) will receive separate instructions about COI disclosures. The IRB will communicate with the personnel listed above or the PI if further documentation is required.

3. If this research is based in a center, institute, or department (Administering Department) other than the one listed above for the PI, select here. Be aware that if you do not enter anything here, the PI's home department will be AUTOMATICALLY inserted when you save this page.

Department	Psychology

3. Funding Sources

1. Is this project funded (or proposed to be funded) by a contract or grant from an organization EXTERNAL to UNC-Chapel Hill?

   No

2. Is this study funded by UNC-CH (e.g., department funds, internal pilot grants, trust accounts)?

   No

3. Is this research classified (e.g. requires governmental security clearance)?

   No

4. Is there a master protocol, grant application, or other proposal supporting this submission (check all that apply)?

- ✖ Grant Application
- ✖ Industry/Federal Sponsor Master Protocol
- ✖ Student Dissertation or Thesis Proposal
- ✖ Investigator Initiated Master Protocol
- ✖ Other Study Protocol

4. Screening Questions

The following questions will help you determine if your project will require IRB review and approval.

The first question is whether this is RESEARCH (click for details)

1. Does your project involve a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, which is designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge? PLEASE NOTE: You should only answer yes if your activity meets all the above.

   Yes

The next questions will determine if there are HUMAN SUBJECTS (click for details)

2. Will you be obtaining information about a living individual through direct intervention or interaction with that individual? This would include any contact with people using questionnaires/surveys, interviews, focus groups, observations, treatment interventions, etc. PLEASE NOTE: Merely obtaining information FROM an individual does not mean you should answer 'Yes,' unless the information is also ABOUT them.

   Yes

3. Will you be obtaining identifiable private information about a living individual collected through means other than direct interaction? This would include data, records or biological specimens that are currently existing or will be collected in the future for purposes other than this proposed research (e.g., medical records, ongoing collection of specimens for a tissue repository).
   OR
   Will you be using human specimens that are not individually identifiable for FDA-regulated in vitro diagnostic (IVD) device investigations?

   No

The following questions will help build the remainder of your application.

4. Will subjects be studied in the Clinical and Translational Research Center (CTRC, previously known as the GCRC) or is the CTRC involved in any other way with the study? (If yes, this application will be reviewed by the CTRC and additional data will be collected.)

   No

5. Does this study directly recruit participants through the UNC Health Care clinical settings for cancer patients **or** does this study have a focus on cancer or a focus on a risk factor for cancer (e.g. increased physical activity to reduce colon cancer incidence) **or** does this study receive funding from a cancer agency, foundation, or other cancer related group? (If yes, this application may require additional review by the Oncology Protocol Review Committee.)

   No

6. Are any personnel, organizations, entities, facilities or locations in addition to UNC-Chapel Hill involved in this research (e.g., is this a multi-site study or does it otherwise involve locations outside UNC-CH, including foreign locations)? You should also click "Yes" if you are requesting reliance on an external IRB, or that UNC's IRB cover another site or individual. See guidance.

   No

Exemptions

Request Exemption

Some research involving human subjects may be eligible for an exemption which would result in fewer application and review requirements. This would not apply in a study that involves drugs or devices, involves greater than minimal risk, or involves medical procedures or deception or minors, except in limited circumstances.

Additional guidance is available at the OHRE website. Exemptions can be confusing; if you have not completed this page before, please review this table with definitions and examples before you begin.

1. Would you like your application evaluated for a possible exemption?

   Yes

Will your study either involve prisoners as participants or be FDA-regulated?

   No

In order to be eligible for exemption, your research must fit into one or more of the following categories. Check all of the following that apply, understanding that most research falls into one or two categories.

Category 1 (click here for guidance and examples)

✔ The research is to be conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings. Note: This applies to the location where education research will actually be conducted (e.g., public schools) and NOT to your location at a university.

And the research will involve normal educational practices, such as:

✘ Research on regular and special education instructional strategies.

✔ Research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

Explain
This research will occur within a college classroom and it will focus on the effect of pluralistic ignorance among students and how it affects academic performance. The goal of this research is to understand the extent to which this exists in order to inform empirical interventions to improve instructional techniques.

Category 2: (click here for guidance and examples)

Does your study involve minors under the age of 18?

No

The research involves the use of one or more of the following

✘ Educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement).

✔ Survey procedures.

✘ Interview procedures

✘ Observation of public behavior.

And either or both of the following is true:

✘ The information to be obtained will be recorded in such a manner that participants cannot be identified, directly or indirectly through identifiers linked to the participants.

✔ Any disclosure of the participants' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Explain
The participants' answers to the four survey questions, all of which pertain to their study habits and perceptions about peer study habits, will not place them at any risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging in any respect.

Category 3 (click here for guidance and examples)

Research involves the use of one or more of the following:

✘ Educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement)

✘ Survey procedures

✘ Interview procedures.

✘ Observation of public behavior.

And

✗ The participants are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

✗ Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

Category 4 (click here for guidance and examples)

✓ The research involves the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.

And either of the following is true:

✗ The sources of data are publicly available.

✓ The investigator records information in such a manner that participants cannot be identified, directly or indirectly through identifiers linked to the participants.

Explain
We will be collecting student test scores, in addition to our survey results for this study. Upon collecting the data, student PID numbers will be matched with test scores and then PID scores will be removed in an effort to eliminate any identifiable participant information.

Category 5 (click here for guidance and examples)

✗ The project is a research or demonstration project.

Additionally the following must also be true.

✗ The program under study delivers a public benefit (e.g., financial or medical benefits as provided under the Social Security Act) or service (e.g., social, supportive, or nutrition services as provided under the Older Americans Act).

✗ The research is conducted pursuant to specific federal statutory authority.

✗ There is no statutory requirement that an IRB review the research.

✗ The research does not involve significant physical invasions or intrusions upon the privacy of participants.

The research is designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine one or more of the following:

✗ Public benefit or service programs.

✗ Procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs.

✗ Possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures.

✗ Possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

Category 6 (click here for guidance and examples)

✗ The research involves taste and food quality evaluation or is a consumer acceptance study.

Either of the following is true:

✖ Wholesome foods without additives are consumed.

✖ If a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient or an agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant, the food ingredient or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant is at or below the level and for a use found to be safe by one of the following agencies:

Please check which of following

✖ The Food and Drug Administration.

✖ The Environmental Protection Agency.

✖ The Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Consent Process for Exemptions

1. While the full regulatory requirements for consent do not apply, some exempt research does involve talking to or interacting with human participants. Under these circumstances, there is still the expectation that you will tell people what you are doing and why, and invite their voluntary participation. If this describes your study, then describe the process for obtaining consent from the subjects. This may or may not include a written consent document or script; if you plan to use a written document, please upload as an attachment as the end of this application process.

Students will be consented upon arriving at class on the day of the exam. When class starts, the students will be directed towards PollEverywhere, where a consent form will appear. At the bottom of the screen, students will have the option to select “yes” to participate or “no” to decline participation.

The consent form is attached at the end of the application.

Part A. Questions Common to All Studies

A.1. Background and Rationale

A.1.1. Provide a summary of the background and rationale for this study (i.e., why is the study needed?). If a complete background and literature review are in an accompanying grant application or other type of proposal, only provide a brief summary here. If there is no proposal, provide a more extensive background and literature review, including references.

The concept of pluralistic ignorance (Allport, 1924; Katz & Allport, 1931) describes a situation in which group members privately reject group norms but believe that other group members accept them, resulting in norm-conforming behavior that does not reflect true attitudes toward a subject. This behavior results from fear of embarrassment; individuals affected by pluralistic ignorance do not want to face the negative social consequences of norm transgression. However, this is only half the story; to experience pluralistic ignorance, individuals must also believe that others are not as motivated by embarrassment, but are instead expressing their own true self. It is this differential attribution that results in pluralistic ignorance. (Miller & McFarland, 1987).

Pluralistic ignorance has been applied perhaps most extensively to the study of alcohol use, which serves as a relevant example for how these processes unfold. Multiple studies establish that adolescents’ alcohol use is consistently predicted by perceived alcohol use of peers (Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). On college campuses, these perceptions translate to injunctive norms that strongly encourage alcohol use (Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986). However, this is not a case where norms and attitudes go hand-in-hand; college students believe they are more uncomfortable with drinking than

not only just the average student (Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986), but even their own friends (Prentice & Miller, 1993). Perhaps most strikingly, group discussions focused around the concept of pluralistic ignorance reduced drinking rates significantly over individual-oriented discussions (Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). Taken together, these findings suggest that alcohol use on college campuses may be a classic example of pluralistic ignorance.

However, pluralistic ignorance may also apply in many other areas where it has been less thoroughly studied. Given the importance of academic success in a college environment, it is plausible that perceptions of peers' academic effort would create an injunctive norm about practices such as studying. To study less than one's peers might invite negative perceptions of laziness, while to study more than one's peers might invite negative perceptions of overachievement. In either direction, departure from the norm could very well result in embarrassment, motivating conformity with a perceived norm of study time and effort.

The current study will measure students' study habits and their perception of their peers' study habits as potential predictors of their academic performance. Pluralistic ignorance suggests that those who perceive their peers to study less will in turn study less themselves, resulting in worse performance; those who perceive their peers to study more, however, will study more and perform better. If pluralistic ignorance is at play in students' academic lives, carefully designed interventions may be able to improve the performance of those who mistakenly believe their peers are studying fewer hours per week.

References:

Allport, F. H. (1924). *Social psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Katz, D., & Allport, F. H. (1931). *Student attitudes: A report of the Syracuse University research study*. Syracuse, NY: Craftsman Press.

Miller, D. T., & McFarland, C. (1987). Pluralistic ignorance: When similarity is interpreted a dissimilarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*(2), 298–305. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.2.298

Perkins, H. W., & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *21*(9-10), 961–976. doi:10.3109/10826088609077249

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: Some consequences of misperceiving the social norm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(2), 243–256. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.243

Schroeder, C. M., & Prentice, D. A. (1998). Exposing pluralistic ignorance to reduce alcohol use among college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *28*(23), 2150–2180. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01365.x

A.2. Subjects

A.2.1. Total number of subjects proposed across all sites by all investigators (provide exact number; if unlimited, enter 9999):

240

A.2.2. Total number of subjects to be studied by the UNC-CH investigator(s) (provide exact number; if unlimited, enter 9999):

240

A.2.3. If the above numbers include multiple groups, cohorts, or ranges or are dependent on unknown factors, or need any explanation, describe here:

The 240 participants will be drawn from two psychology classes at UNC, PSYC 260 (Social Psychology) and PSYC 245 (Abnormal Psychology).

A.2.4. Do you have specific plans to enroll subjects from these vulnerable or select populations:
Do not check if inclusion of a group is purely coincidental and has no bearing on the research. For example, you should check "Pregnant women" if you specifically intend to recruit women who are pregnant. Do not check if you are conducting a survey of the general public, not aimed at pregnant women. See SOP 1201: Vulnerable subjects in research.

- ✗ Children (under the age of majority for their location)

Any minor subject who attains the age of majority during the course of the research study must provide consent as an adult, unless consent has been waived, which is requested in section D.3.1.

- ✗ Pregnant women
- ✗ Nonviable neonates or neonates of uncertain viability
- ✗ Prisoners, others involuntarily detained or incarcerated (this includes parolees held in treatment centers as a condition of their parole)

If an enrolled participant becomes incarcerated during the course of the research, they must be removed from the research project until such time as the IRB (and OHRP for NIH funded projects) approves the study to include prisoners, unless there is an immediate risk to the participant from ending treatments under the protocol.

- ✗ UNC-CH Student athletes, athletic teams, or coaches

A.2.5. Based on your recruitment plan and target sample population, are you likely to include any of the following as subjects? Select all that apply.
Based on your responses, the consent form builder will insert the required text into your consent form template.

- ✗ Decisionally impaired individuals

(e.g., Mini mental state examination (MMSE), Montreal cognitive assessment (MOCA))

- ✗ Children who are wards of the State (Foster children)
- ✗ Non-English-speaking individuals
- ✓ UNC-CH Students

Some research involving students may be eligible for waiver of parental permission (e.g., using departmental participant pools). See SOP 32.9.1

- ✗ UNC-CH Employees
- ✗ People, including children, who are likely to be involved in abusive relationships, either as perpetrator or victim.
This would include studies that might uncover or expose child, elder or domestic abuse/neglect. (See SOP Appendix H)

A.2.6. If any of the above populations are checked (excluding 'Decisionally impaired individuals' and 'Children who are wards of the State (Foster children)'), please describe your plans to provide additional protections for these subjects.

As we do not anticipate that these questions, which assess the amount of time that each student has

studied for the test and their perceptions of other students' study habits, will be distressing or incriminating in any way, we do not envision needing to provide additional protection to this population.

A.2.7. Age range of subjects:

Minimum age of subject enrolled	18
	years
Maximum age of subject enrolled	99
» If no maximum age limit, indicate 99	
	years

A.4. Study design, methods and procedures

Your response to the next question will help determine what further questions you will be asked in the following sections.

A.4.1. Will you be using any **methods or procedures commonly used in biomedical or clinical research** (this would include but not be limited to drawing blood, performing lab tests or biological monitoring, conducting physical exams, administering drugs, or conducting a clinical trial)?

No

A.4.2. Describe the study design. List and describe study procedures, including a sequential description of what subjects will be asked to do, when relevant.

1. This study will be conducted online, using the Poll Everywhere classroom response software system (PollEverywhere.com).

Volunteer student participants from PSYC 260 (Social Psychology) and PSYC 245 (Abnormal Psychology) will first be consented online via PollEverywhere.com and they will have the option to select "yes" to participate or "no" to decline participation. They will be told that their participation will have no bearing on their standing in the class. Of those who consent, they will be asked four successive questions approximately 7 minutes before an examination. The total time of participation will be approximately 2 minutes. The questions will be described as a classroom assessment technique (CAT) that will allow the instructor to better understand how students prepare for examinations. The questions are as follows:

a. What is your PID# ?

b. How many hours did you spend studying for this examination?

c. How many hours, on average, did your peers spend studying for this examination?

d. How sure are you of your estimate of your peers' studying?

Questions two and three will be open-ended so that participants can respond freely. Participants will respond to the fourth question on a 10-point Likert scale with response options from 1 (not at all sure) to 10 (completely sure).

Once participants have responded to all four questions they will be thanked for their participation. Because the hypothesis of this study involves measuring the influence of peer norm beliefs on exam performance, complete debriefing will occur after participants turn in their examinations.

After the examinations are completed and graded, participants' survey responses will be linked to their exam scores. Once this process is completed, participants' PID numbers will be removed from the data file and deleted. Thus, the data will be stored anonymously.

Our hypothesis is that the extent of pluralistic ignorance (the deviation from the true mean of time spent studying) will be related to exam performance. Thus, we predict those who under-estimate the true amount of time that their peers study will perform worse on the examination and those who over-estimate the true amount of time that their peers study will perform better on the examination.

A.4.3. Will this study use any of the following methods?

- ✗ Audio Recording
- ✗ Video Recording
- ✗ Behavioral observation - (e.g., Participant, naturalistic, experimental, and other observational methods typically used in social science research)
- ✗ Pencil and paper questionnaires or surveys
- ✓ Electronic questionnaires or surveys
- ✗ Telephone questionnaires or surveys
- ✗ Interview questionnaires or surveys
- ✗ Other questionnaires or surveys
- ✗ Focus groups
- ✗ Diaries or journals
- ✗ Photovoice
- ✗ Still photography

A.4.4. If there are procedures or methods that require specialized training, describe who (role/qualifications) will be involved and how they will be trained.

n/a

A.4.5. Are there cultural issues, concerns or implications for the methods to be used with this study population?

No

A.6. Risks and measures to minimize risks

For each of the following categories of risk you will be asked to describe any items checked and what will be done to minimize the risks.

A.6.1. Psychological

- ✗ Emotional distress
- ✗ Embarrassment
- ✗ Consequences of breach of confidentiality (Check and describe only once on this page)
- ✗ Other

A.6.2. Describe any potential psychological risks checked above and what will be done to minimize these risks

No Answer Provided

A.6.3. Social

- ✗ Loss of reputation or standing within the community
- ✗ Harms to a larger group or community beyond the subjects of the study (e.g., stigmatization)
- ✓ Consequences of breach of confidentiality (Check and describe only once on this page)
- ✗ Other

A.6.4. Describe any potential social risks checked above and what will be done to minimize these risks

Upon integrating the data from the survey and the student test scores into one data set, each student's PID number will be removed from the data. This, coupled with the security measures taken to protect the data, suggests that there will be minimal chances (less than 1%) of a breach of confidentiality occurring.

A.6.5. Economic

- ✗ Loss of income
- ✗ Loss of employment or insurability
- ✗ Loss of professional standing or reputation
- ✗ Loss of standing within the community
- ✗ Consequences of breach of confidentiality (Check and describe only once on this page)
- ✗ Other

A.6.6. Describe any potential economic risks checked above and what will be done to minimize these risks.

No Answer Provided

A.6.7. Legal

- ✗ Disclosure of illegal activity
- ✗ Disclosure of negligence
- ✗ Consequences of breach of confidentiality (Check and describe only once on this page)
- ✗ Other

A.6.8. Describe any potential legal risks checked above and what will be done to minimize these risks

No Answer Provided

A.6.9. Physical

- ✗ Medication side effects
- ✗ Pain
- ✗ Discomfort

✗ Injury

✗ To a nursing child or a fetus (either through mother or father)

A.6.10. Describe any potential physical risks checked above, including the category of likelihood and severity, and what will be done to minimize these risks. Where possible, describe the likelihood of the risks occurring, using the following terms:

- Very Common (approximate incidence > 50%)
- Common (approximate incidence > 25 - 50%)
- Likely (approximate incidence of > 10 - 25%)
- Infrequent (approximate incidence of > 1 - 10%)
- Rare (approximate incidence < 1%)

Describe severity of risks using the following grading scale:

- Mild- No disruption to the subject's ability to perform daily activities; may include non-prescription intervention only
- Moderate- Temporary interference with daily activities; may include prescription intervention
- Severe- Interference with daily activities; medically significant but not life threatening
- Life threatening

Examples:

Rare (Rare (

If you are using these terms differently than described above, please provide your study-specific definitions.

Phase 1 trials: Due to limited experience, incidence may be better described as the number of events that have occurred in the total number of animals/humans studied.

No Answer Provided

A.6.11. Unless already addressed above, describe procedures for referring subjects who are found, during the course of this study, to be in need of medical follow-up or psychological counseling

No Answer Provided

A.6.12. Are there plans to withdraw or follow subjects (or partners of subjects) who become pregnant while enrolled in this study?

No

A.9. Identifiers

A.9.1. Check which of the following identifiers you already have or will be receiving, or select "None of the above."

✓ Names (this would include names/signatures on consent forms)

✗ Telephone numbers

✗ Any elements of dates (other than year) for dates directly related to an individual, including birth date, admission date, discharge date, date of death. For ages over 89: all elements of dates (including year) indicative of such age, except that such ages and elements may be aggregated into a single category of age 90 and older

✗ Any geographic subdivisions smaller than a State, including street address, city, county, precinct, zip code and their equivalent geocodes (e.g. GPS coordinates), except for the initial three digits of a zip code

✗ Fax numbers

✗ Electronic mail addresses

- ✗ Social Security numbers
- ✗ Medical record numbers
- ✗ Health plan beneficiary numbers
- ✗ Account numbers
- ✗ Certificate/license numbers
- ✗ Vehicle identifiers and serial numbers (VIN), including license plate numbers
- ✗ Device identifiers and serial numbers (e.g., implanted medical device)
- ✗ Web universal resource locators (URLs)
- ✗ Internet protocol (IP) address numbers
- ✗ Biometric identifiers, including finger and voice prints
- ✗ Full face photographic images and any comparable images
- ✓ Any other unique identifying number, code, or characteristic, other than dummy identifiers that are not derived from actual identifiers and for which the re-identification key is maintained by the health care provider and not disclosed to the researcher
- ✗ None of the above

A.9.2. For any identifiers checked, how will these identifiers be stored in relationship to the research data?

- ✗ with the research data (i.e., in the same data set and/or physical location)
- ✓ separate from the research data (i.e., coded with a linkage file stored in a different physical location)

Provide details about the option you selected above:
The students will submit their PID and then answer the three questions that follow. This information will be separated after all data is collected.

A.9.3. Are you collecting Social Security Numbers to be used as a unique identifier for study tracking purposes for national registry or database? (Do not check yes if collecting SSN *only* for payment purposes; this will be addressed later.)

No

A.10. Confidentiality of the data

A.10.1. Describe procedures for maintaining confidentiality of the data you will collect or will receive (e.g., coding, anonymous responses, use of pseudonyms, etc.).

In terms of maintaining student confidentiality, student names will not appear on the spreadsheet the holds the data. Rather, their PID numbers will be used. Furthermore, immediately after collection, PID numbers will be disassociated from questionnaire answers and exam scores.

A.10.2. Will any of the groupings or subgroupings used in analysis be small enough to allow individuals to be identified?

No

Part B. Direct Interaction

B.1. Methods of recruiting

B.1.1. Check all the following means/methods of subject recruitment to be used:*

- ✔ In person
- ✘ Participant pools
- ✘ Presentation to classes or other groups
- ✘ Letters
- ✘ Flyers
- ✘ Radio, TV recruitment ads
- ✘ Newspaper recruitment ads
- ✘ Website recruitment ads
- ✘ Telephone script
- ✘ Email or listserv announcements
- ✘ Follow up to initial contact (e.g., email, script, letter)
- ✘ Other

B.1.2. Describe how subjects will be identified

Every member of the PSYC 260 (Social Psychology) and PSYC 245 (Abnormal Psychology) classes in the study will be eligible to participate.

B.1.3. Describe how and where subjects will be recruited and address the likelihood that you will have access to the projected number of subjects identified in A.2.

Students will be recruited in their classroom. Their professor will ask the students in the class if they would be willing to answer a few questions about classroom assessment techniques that will allow the instructor to better understand how students prepare for examinations. If they consent via PollEverywhere.com, they will then answer the four questions via the same medium. As these questions will take approximately two minutes to answer, we anticipate that the majority of the 240 students in these classes will participate.

Part C. Existing Data, Records, Specimens

C.1. Data Sources

C.1.1. What existing records, data or human biological specimens will you be using? (Indicate all that apply or select 'None of the above'):

- ✘ Medical records in any format.

  ALERT: You must check both boxes: 1) Medical records in any format and 2) Electronic medical record using Epic, or you/your study team will not be granted access to Epic for research purposes.
- ✘ Electronic medical records using Epic, WebCIS or other electronic system
- ✘ Carolina Data Warehouse for Health (CDW-H) (for UNC and its affiliates only)
- ✘ Carolinas Collaborative Data Request and Review Committee (DRRC)
- ✘ Paper medical records

If you access the records of fewer than 50 patients under a full or limited waiver of HIPAA, submit a copy of your IRB approval letter and a completed Research Disclosure Form to Health Information Management (HIM). Do not submit this information to the IRB. For additional information about this process, you should contact HIM directly at : 919-595-5591 or 919-966-1225 or 919-595-5580.

✗ Data already collected from another research study

Were the investigators for the current application involved in the original collection?	--

✗ Patient specimens (tissues, blood, serum, surgical discards, etc.)

Has the clinical purpose for which they were collected been met before removal of any excess?	--

✗ Data already collected for administrative purposes

✓ Student records (You will need to satisfy FERPA requirements: see SOP 2301, section 1.1 for guidance)

✗ UNC Dental Records

✗ Data coming directly from a health plan, health care clearinghouse, or health care provider?

✗ Publicly available data

✗ Other

✗ None of the above

For EACH data source checked above, provide a description of the data, proposed use, how data were collected (including consent procedures), and where data currently reside.

The data will be the results from the brief pre-test survey as well as the test score from the subsequent test. Students will be consented upon entering the class. Upon collecting the data and matching up survey results with test scores, student names and PID numbers will be immediately removed and then stored in the P.I.'s password protected computer.

C.1.2. Describe your plans for obtaining permission from the custodians of the data, records or specimens (e.g., pathology dept, tissue bank, original researcher):

n/a

C.1.3. Do the custodians of the data, records or specimens require a data use agreement?

No

C.2. Coding and Data Use Agreements

C.2.1. When you receive these data, records or human biological specimens will they be coded? Coded means identifying information that would enable the research team to readily ascertain the individual's identity has been replaced with a number, letter, symbol, or combination thereof (i.e., a code). If you will not be using existing materials, check "No."

No

Answer the questions below to identify the mechanism which precludes your access to the codes and include a copy of any agreements or documents that explain these protections:

Data use agreement with custodian of data (agreement prohibiting the release of the key to decipher the code to the applicant under any circumstances)?	--

Note: For Data Use Agreements, Non-Clinical Agreements, or Clinical Agreement Amendments, please submit the New OIC RRF and draft materials via email to OIC@unc.edu	--
Data are publicly available?	--
Honest broker (centralized custodian who controls data and will not release codes or IDs)?	--
Other	--

Attachments

This submission requires the following attachments

Document Type
Electronic Questionnaire Survey

This submission includes the following attachments

File Name	Document Type
CAT_Electronic Survey.docx	Electronic Questionnaire Survey
Assistant Provost Approval.txt	Other
CAT_Consent_Form.docx	Other

view attachments

Addenda

Data Security Requirements

view addenda

If Principal Investigator of this study is a Student or Trainee Investigator, the Faculty Advisor certifies the following:

I accept ultimate responsibility for ensuring that this study complies with all the obligations listed above for the PI.

By certifying below, the Principal Investigator affirms the following:

I will personally conduct or supervise this research study. I will ensure that this study is performed in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and University policies regarding human subjects research. I will obtain IRB approval before making any changes or additions to the project. I will notify the IRB of any other changes in the information provided in this application. I will provide progress reports to the IRB at least annually, or as requested. I will report promptly to the IRB all unanticipated problems or serious adverse events involving risk to human subjects. I will follow the IRB approved consent process for all subjects. I will ensure that all collaborators, students and employees assisting in this research study are informed about these obligations. All information given in this form is accurate and complete.

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

Certifying Signatures:

Signature: Electronic Signature Received **Date:** 2/03/2015 12:05:06 PM
Steven Buzinski

The expectation is that this approval is being given on behalf of the head of the Department, Division, or Center. If the chair or director is an investigator on this project or otherwise conflicted in approving it, the Vice-Chair or Chair's designee should review it. By approving, you are certifying the following on behalf of your department, division or center:

- This research is appropriate for this Investigator and our department
- The investigator(s) are qualified to conduct the research
- There are adequate resources (including financial, support and facilities) available
- For units that have a local review committee for pre-IRB review, this requirement has been satisfied
- I support this application, and hereby submit it for further review

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

If you are approving for other purposes (e.g., CTRC, DSMB, IBC, PRC, RSC, or other review committees), you affirm the following:

- The proposed submission is approved and may be forwarded for IRB review.

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

Department Approval Signatures:

By signing in the appropriate space, the Department Chairperson(s) is indicating only that he/she has seen and reviewed this submission

Department: Psychology
Signature: Electronic Signature Received **Date:** 2/03/2015 11:21:25 AM
Name & Title: Eric Youngstrom, Professor