Response to Reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. The reviewer is concerned that some subjects may be under 18. I will make certain that they are all 18 before the study is conducted.

2. The reviewer wants more information on the recruiting process. I will stand up in front of the class and explain that I am doing a study on the participants’ ability to detect deception and that participation is voluntary. I will then hand out consent forms to further explain the study. Those who choose to participate will stay. Those who do not can leave or sit and observe if they so choose. They will also be notified about the study at least one class period in advance. I will be using a sign-in not a sign-up sheet. This will be a simple pad of paper on which the participants will pint their names and sign indicating that they participated.

3. Reviewer 1 wants to see the answer form. The answer form is now attached.

4. The reviewer questions exemption and anonymity. I believe that the study is exempt under category 2. It is research involving a survey procedure wherein the information cannot be linked to subjects. The project is anonymous. The definition of anonymous is not that you have no idea who participated, but that you are unable to link answers to specific participants. This is the case with this study. I will know who participated because of the sign-in sheet, but will not know who gave any particular set of answers.

Related to this is the issue of signature lines on the consent form. I believe that the study qualifies to remove the signature line on the basis of your check list, number 26, bullet 2. The study involves only minimal risk and this would not require written consent outside of the research context. This prevents the wasting of paper by having to produce two copies for each consent form. I have also used this procedure for similar studies at other universities.