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1. In the new consent form, you cannot have both confidentiality and anonymity. Further, you do not have anonymity in this study (49 other people in the actual study, and all members of their class, are aware of their participation in the research). Remove anonymity.

I removed the word, anonymity.

2. Although I understand that you believe that deception is an important element in your design, I do not believe that you have met the APA standards for creating a compelling rationale for use of deception (8.07a) (this is what I referring to in the earlier concern #3), nor does your public debriefing on a website meet the standards for 8.07c.

8.07 Deception in Research

(a) Psychologists do not conduct a study involving deception unless they have determined that the use of deceptive techniques is justified by the study\'s significant prospective scientific, educational, or applied value and that effective nondeceptive alternative procedures are not feasible.

(b) Psychologists do not deceive prospective participants about research that is reasonably expected to cause physical pain or severe emotional distress.

(c) Psychologists explain any deception that is an integral feature of the design and conduct of an experiment to participants as early as is feasible, preferably at the conclusion of their participation, but no later than at the conclusion of the data collection, and permit participants to withdraw their data. (See also Standard 8.08, Debriefing.)\" <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html#8_07>

*Rationale:* To explain my need to withhold the true purpose of the study, I added the following sentences to point #4 on the synopsis.

IF I tell the student participants that they will hear a lecture by either a lecturer who smells like normal, a lecturer who smells like smoke, or a lecturer who smells like alcohol; then I am telling the participants that this is a manipulation, and the participants are less likely to believe that the lecturer actually smokes or drank alcohol before giving the lecture. If they do not believe that the person smokes, then there is no reason to feel prejudiced against them for smoking. In other words, the data for the study will be completely meaningless. This is the reason for my need to withhold the true purpose of the study. Please note, however, that I never actively lie to the participants, in that I never tell them that there is a different purpose. Nevertheless, I do realize that withholding the true purpose of the study is a form of passive deception and that the potential risks of such passive deception must be outweighed by significant benefits, which are described in point #6 below.

For justification based on the study’s value, I elaborated on this value in point #6 on the synopsis.

Participation in this study will give participants experience with important research in educational and social psychology, which will benefit instructors and their students, as well as shed more light on our prejudicial biases (whether explicit or implicit) and their impact on learning. Past research shows that, on instructor evaluation forms, students give lower ratings to instructors in minority groups (e.g., Crandall & Cohen, 1994; Ewing et at., 2003; Russ et al., 2002), reflecting prejudicial biases. Given that students report learning less from instructors who they deem as not credible (Beatty, Behnke, & Henderson, 1980; Teven & McCroskey, 1997), then these prejudicial biases may result in students learning less in a course. However, research has not yet assessed the impact of such prejudices on actual learning. Regarding the implications, if we find that students provide lower evaluation ratings to the lecturers who smell like smoke and if the students learn less from those lecturers, for instance, then instructors who smoke may adjust their behavior. Those instructors may either try to hide their smoking, or more optimistically, upon discovering these negative effects, those instructors may be provided with an additional incentive to quit smoking. The students, then, may think more highly of the instructor than they otherwise would have. In turn, they may learn more, and they may provide the instructor with higher evaluation ratings that impact merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Beyond these benefits, this research is providing four undergraduate research assistances (identified on the consent form) with valuable research experience that will be rewarding and may also help them achieve admission into graduate school. Finally, we hope to publish the findings of this research in a reputable peer-reviewed journal, and this productivity, combined with the aforementioned benefits, will be favorable for the university. In summary, the potential benefits of this research are as follows: stimulating thinking about prejudicial biases in our society; greater student learning, greater instructor evaluation ratings and resulting raises and promotions, and better health for instructors if the instructors change their behavior based on the results of the study; valuable experience for research assistants who will benefit into graduate school; and university recognition.

*Debriefing:* In the new consent form, I have included the following paragraph:

After you complete the survey mentioned in the second paragraph of this consent form, you will be informed about the exact questions that the study examined and what anticipated results may occur. This information will be provided orally by Dr. Crystal Oberle, and in writing in an additional paper that will be given to you. If you would like additional information, please contact Dr. Oberle at oberle@txstate.edu or 512-245-3166. After all data have been collected for this study, by May 1, a written summary of the findings will be posted online at the following address: http://www.psych.txstate.edu/research/debriefing.php

3. I found your somewhat cavalier attitude toward student confidentiality in the classroom sign-up a bit problematic (in your response you state “Given that the students will be signing up to attend one of the lectures with 50 other students, the fact that they are participating will be known by the other student participants, and using a different method of recruiting will not prevent that fact. Further, by including their names on a sign-up sheet, they are only acknowledging that they wish to participate in this study; they are not disclosing any personal information. Finally, and extending off of the previous statement, I believe that the method of signing up is only an ethical issue for studies with special populations (e.g., people with HIV), in which a public signature reveals such an identity.”). Universities around the country provide on line sign-ups (e.g., [www.trentu.ca/psychology/documents/PRPS\_StudentUserGuide.pdf](http://www.trentu.ca/psychology/documents/PRPS_StudentUserGuide.pdf) ) or in-person sign-ups with pre-created code numbers for school-based psychological experiments (e.g.,www.nau.edu/~psych/Forms/Handbook2006.pdf), as students are not bound to confidentiality prior to the research, in order to protect students\' confidentiality (the same way grades are posted with such codes to avoid violating FERPA). It is not outside of standard practice to ask you to do so as well.

I am sorry that you found my attitude to be cavalier. However, I stand by my original position in the quote above, and here is my support beyond what is already presented in the quote. First, the other IRB reviewer, as well as an additional member of the IRB, had no problem with me using sign-up sheets. Second, I just surveyed eight different faculty members, who conduct research with student participants. Every single one of them has used and/or is currently using sign-up sheets to recruit participants. I would like to be held to the same standards as my colleagues.

**03/11/09 09:34:10**

1. The level of deception in this proposal may be acceptable considering the positive outcomes of the study. As a standard procedure, please include in your study and consent form that a debriefing will take place after the study. In this debriefing, the participants will meet with the researcher after the study and the researcher WILL explain the real purpose of the study which was different from what they had consented too. The researchers will also explain the need for deception and refer participants who have adverse reactions to the study or to the fact that they were deceived to counseling services (if need be). It would be preferable if this debriefing is done orally as well as by giving all participants some type of written document explaining the study, need for deception and information about counseling services. I will approve this study after a statement about debriefing is included in the consent form. I would also like to see a \'debriefing\' document that the researchers would give out.

On the consent form, I have included the debriefing paragraph, which is quoted in response to the other IRB reviewer’s comment #2 above. After that paragraph, I included the following paragraph:

If you experience any distress from your participation in this study, you may want to contact the Texas State Counseling Center. Mental health services at the Counseling Center are free to registered students, though the number of sessions allowed may be limited. If you seek another mental health provider, any costs incurred for these mental health services are your sole responsibility. Contact information for the Counseling Center and for three outside mental health providers are provided below.

* Texas State Counseling Center / phone: 512-245-2208 / email: counselingcenter@txstate.edu / location: 5-4.1 LBJ Student Center on the campus of Texas State University in San Marcos, TX
* Kathie Cleveland, LPC / phone: 512-353-3103 / location: 829 N. LBJ, Suite #207 in San Marcos, TX
* Winston Haun, PsyD / phone: 512-396-1722 / location: 13 Pampass Pass in San Marcos, TX
* Trini Rodriguez, LPC / phone: 512-396-7170 / location: 205 Chetham St., Suite #1 in San Marcos, TX

Along with this summary of revisions, I will also be uploading the debriefing document that I will give the participants after I orally debrief them with the same information.