

Replicating findings on the attribution of knowledge and luck

Protocol Information

Principal Investigator (PI) Name:*

Michael R. Andreychik

Which of the following are you?*

- ☐ Undergraduate Student
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☒ Faculty/Staff Member
- ☐ Local PI for External Researcher

Principal Investigator (PI) Fairfield Faculty e-mail:*

mandreychik@fairfield.edu

Protocol Title:*

Replicating findings on the attribution of knowledge and luck

Co-PIs: Please list all Co-PIs' Names, Titles, and Affiliations.

External PIs: Please list all External PIs' Names, Titles, and Affiliations.

Research Associates: Please list all Research Associates' Names, Titles, and Affiliations.

Research Start Date:*

11/01/2018

(Estimated) Research End Date:*

11/01/2019

Funding Source:

N/A

Review Type Selection

Which type of review would you like to submit this research protocol?*

- ☒ Expedited Review
- ☐ Full Board Review
- ☐ Quality Improvement
- ☐ Delegation to External IRB
- ☐ Exemption from IRB Review
- ☐ External PI Application

Expedited/Full Board Review

With which designation will you be submitting this application?*

- ☒ Expedited Review
- ☐ Full Board Review

Which of the following most closely aligns with your study? (Please use the information icon to view option details and referenced material for each of the options.)*

HHS/OHRP Exp. Cat. 7: Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior.



Clearly state the purpose of the study. (Usually this will include the research hypothesis.)*

We are conducting this study as part of the Collaborative Replication and Education Project (CREP). The CREP aims to improve undergraduate training while efficiently gathering reliable psychological evidence through crowdsourced replication. Our research lab—along with 28 other labs across 4 continents—plans to conduct a replication and extension of one of the studies reported in Turri, Buckwalter and Blouw (2014), which examines the ways in which people come to decide whether or not other people truly “know” something (as opposed to, e.g., merely believing that something is true). Through replicating this study, we will be helping to address the reliability and generalizability of the original findings.

In their work, Turri, Buckwalter, and Blouw (2014) test a classic theory from philosophy called Justified True Belief Theory. Justified True Belief Theory holds that there are three conditions that must be met for a person to possess “true” knowledge. First, the person must believe something. Second, that thing must actually be true. And third, the reasons the person has for their belief must be logical. Only if these conditions are met the person is said to truly “know” the thing. Gettier (1963) observed however, that it is possible for these conditions to be met, and for the person to not have “true” knowledge. Such a situation can occur when the person holds a belief and the belief is true, but the reasons the person has for holding the belief are not the actual reasons the belief is true (i.e., the person is lucky that they are correct). Because this logic can be difficult to follow, here is a concrete example:

"Two men, Smith and Jones, have applied to the same job at the same company. Much to Smith's disappointment, the president of the company has told Smith that Jones will ultimately get the job. Smith then notices that Jones has ten coins in his pocket, coins which Smith counted himself (oddly enough). Smith then infers that the man who gets the job (who he assumes will be Jones) will have ten coins in his pocket (which he counted in Jones' pocket himself): a belief that is well founded by the evidence and therefore justified. However, quite unexpectedly, Smith ends up getting the job! And, unbeknownst to himself, Smith coincidentally also has ten coins in his pocket. Now, while this was absolutely not the outcome that Smith was expecting, his inferred belief that the man who will get the job will have ten coins in his pocket still turned out to be true, just not for the reason he thought (Gettier, 1963)."

Even though Smith's belief was both true and justified, Gettier argued that people would not judge Smith to have had knowledge in this case. Smith clearly just got lucky. Instances in which people's epistemic intuitions lead them to not attribute knowledge to a protagonist in a Gettier case have since been referred to as Gettier intuitions (DePaul & Ramsey, 1998; Machery et al., 2017; Sosa, 2011).

At issue however is whether or not ordinary people actually show evidence of holding such Gettier intuitions. In their studies, Turri, Buckwalter, and Blouw (2014) did demonstrate that people hold Gettier intuitions. But, although their paper has been very influential in philosophy and philosophical psychology, it was a relatively small study. This fact, combined with the inconsistency between Turri et al.'s findings and those of other studies on Gettier intuitions, call for further study to provide a highly-powered test of their hypotheses. This project represents just such a test.

Along with all other participating labs, we will be conducting a direct replication (and extension) of Turri, Buckwalter, and Blouw's Study 1. The direct replication will involve administering Turri et al.'s materials and procedure exactly as reported in their article (see attached). Our proposed extension will involve varying the expertise of the target in their vignette to examine whether people are more or less likely to draw on their Gettier intuitions when the target is an expert (e.g., a formally-trained scientist) vs. a non-expert (e.g., a volunteer data collector).

Background (Describe past studies and any relevant experimental or clinical findings that led to the plan for this project.)*

Please see above.

Research Plan (Provide an orderly, scientific description of the intended methodology and procedures as the directly affects the subjects.)*

The procedure will parallel the procedure reported in Turri, Buckwalter, and Blouw (2014) exactly. Participants will be introduced to a study on "how people think about behavior." They will then receive one of six different experimental conditions. Three of these are taken directly from the original materials of Turri et al., and three conditions were created by us to test whether or not the expertise of a protagonist affects how likely people are to draw Gettier intuitions. The conditions we created differ from the original materials only in terms of the job title given to the protagonist.

After reading their assigned condition, participants will complete some questions concerning their attribution of knowledge to the protagonist, whether the protagonist was justified in their belief, etc. These questions are identical to those administered in the original Turri et al. study. Finally, participants will complete some basic demographic information and will be debriefed.

The original Turri et al. paper, which includes all of the materials, is attached. Notably, Turri et al. did not report any adverse effects of these procedures on their participants, and the materials seem quite innocuous on their face. We thus do not anticipate any issues for participants resulting from their participation.

At what location(s) will the study take place? Please be as specific as possible.*

The study will take place in research labs or classrooms on the campus of Fairfield University in Fairfield CT.

Duration of the project:*

Approximately 1 year.

Describe who will be included in the study as participants and any inclusion/exclusion criteria.*

Fairfield University undergraduate participants will be asked to participate in the study through the Psychology Department's Research Participation Pool. Only students 18 or older are eligible to participate. They are able to select and sign up for timeslots from a commercial online system. In some psychology courses, participation in a fixed number of hours of research is part of the course requirement, and in others it is extra credit. In both cases, the credit given is nominal, students choose which studies they want to participate in, and an equitable alternative (e.g., a short writing assignment about research) is always available to students to earn credit in the Participant Pool should they chose not to or are unable to participate in research studies.

What is the intended age range of the study's participants?*

All participants will be over 18 years of age.

Describe how participant recruitment will be performed.*

Fairfield University undergraduate participants will be asked to participate in the study through the Psychology Department's Research Participation Pool. Only students 18 or older are eligible to participate. They are able to select and sign up for timeslots from a commercial online system. In some psychology courses, participation in a fixed number of hours of research is part of the course requirement, and in others it is extra credit. In both cases, the credit given is nominal, students choose which studies they want to participate in, and an equitable alternative (e.g., a short writing assignment about research) is always available to students to earn credit in the Participant Pool should they chose not to or are unable to participate in research studies.

The IRB must review advertisements for participant recruitment if they contain more than: the study title, purpose, summary, basic eligibility criteria, study site location(s), and site contact information. Please upload your Advertisement(s) for IRB review if it contains more than the information listed.

What are the benefits to participants of this study?*

Student participants may receive course credit or extra course credit in their classes. Additionally, participation in actual studies helps to provide students with valuable hands-on experience with the process of actual psychological research, and so serves as a valuable teaching tool.

What are the risks (physical, social, psychological, legal, economic, etc.) to participants of this study?*

I estimate any potential risks associated with this study to be minimal. All of the tasks are taken directly from or based closely on existing tasks that have been used numerous times in existing research without incident.

If deception is involved, please explain.

N/A

Indicate the degree of risk (physical, social, psychological, legal, economic, etc.) you believe the research poses to human subjects?*

- ☒ Minimal Risk: The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposed research is not greater, in and of themselves, than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.
- ☐ Greater Than Minimal Risk: The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposed research is greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.

Are participants to be financially compensated for the study?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Will participants who are students be offered class credit?*

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No/Not Applicable

If course credit is being offered to student participants, please describe any alternative assignment(s) non-participating students may complete to receive an equal amount of credit.

In some psychology courses, participation in a fixed number of hours of research is part of the course requirement, and in others it is extra credit. In both cases, the credit given is nominal, students choose which studies they want to participate in, and an equitable alternative (e.g., a short writing assignment about research) is always available to students to earn credit in the Participant Pool should they chose not to or are unable to participate in research studies.

If necessary, please describe any additional recruitment inducements:

Will personal identifiers (name, social security number, license number, phone number, email address, photograph) be collected?*

☒ Yes

☐ No

Will personal identifiers be translated to a code?*

☒ Yes

☐ No

Describe how you will protect participant confidentiality and secure research documents, recordings (audio, video, photos), specimens, and other records.*

Although participants will provide their name on the consent form, consent forms are stored separately from the responses participants provide to the facial judgment task itself. This ensures that participants identity is never linked in any direct way with their responses. All forms and data from the study are kept in a locked research laboratory accessible only to the primary investigator and members of the active research team. Computer files actually containing the data are accessible only with a password known only to the primary investigator. Because this is a collaborative many-labs project, ultimately the data from this study will be combined with the data from other studies being run in parallel at other labs. Although the data will thus be shared, the shared data will contain no information that could be used to personally identify participants.

Do you plan to use a written consent form that each participant must read and sign?*

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please describe how consent will be obtained and by whom:*

Consent will be obtained by trained research assistants who will present subjects with a written consent form. These research assistants are carefully trained to answer the most common questions potential subjects may have about the study.

If the participants are minors under the age of 18 years, will assent forms be used?*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Not Applicable

Please upload any consent and/or assent forms that participants and/or parents/guardians will be required to sign. (If you have obtained a Waiver of Informer Consent from the Fairfield IRB, you may skip this step.)

Type	Document Name	File Name	Version Date	Version	Size
Protocol Description	Consent Document- Knowledge and Luck v2	Consent Document- Knowledge and Luck v2.doc	10/17/2018	2	29.5 KB

General Upload/Info Area

If you would like to include a message to the Chair with your initial application submission, please type it here:

Thank you for your consideration!

Please use this box to respond to any application comments and/or requests from the IRB:

Please upload any additional documentation having to do with this protocol application here:

Type	Document Name	File Name	Version Date	Version	Size
Protocol Description	Turri2015_Article_KnowledgeAndLuck	Turri2015_Article_KnowledgeAndLuck.pdf	10/09/2018	1	364.9 KB