



Erin Buchanan <aggieerin@gmail.com>

IRB Notice

IRB <irb_no_reply@cayuse.com>

Wed, Oct 30, 2013 at 1:41 PM

To: "Buchanan, Erin M" <ErinBuchanan@missouristate.edu>

Cc: "Bankovich, Farren E" <Farren1@live.missouristate.edu>, "Vu, My Q" <My03@live.missouristate.edu>, "Schnefke, Mark P" <Schnefke195@live.missouristate.edu>, "Wagner, Tara G" <Tara121@live.missouristate.edu>, "Saxton, Samantha D" <Saxton08@live.missouristate.edu>

To: Erin Buchanan
Psychology
HILL 214D 901 S National Ave Springfield MO 65897

Approval Date: 10/30/2013**Expiration Date of Approval:** 10/29/2014**RE:** Notice of IRB Approval by Expedited Review (under 45 CFR 46.110)**Submission Type:** Initial**Expedited Category:** 7.Surveys/interviews/focus groups**Study #:** 14-0182**Study Title:** Judgment Confidence Ratings for Association 2013

This submission has been approved by the above IRB for the period indicated. It has been determined that the risk involved in this research is no more than minimal.

Study Description:

In a judgments-of-memory task, participants are given pairs of words and asked to judge how many people out of 100 would put those two words together. For instance, when given the pair LOST-FOUND, participants should mark that about 75 people say FOUND when given LOST. Maki (2007) and Buchanan (2009) have shown that these judgments are very insensitive to the difference between high frequency and low frequency pairs, as well as upwardly biased. These judgments are similar to judgments of learning, where participants are asked to learn material and then judge how well they will do on an exam of that material. Participants are quite bad at guessing how well they will do, showing very biased answers, especially the poorer performers (Koriat & Bjork, 2006). When asked about the task, participants often describe that it was "easy", but they had a hard time guessing numbers for the experiment. In fact, a wide range of participant performance exists that cannot be accounted by working memory or fluid intelligence (Buchanan, manuscript revision). In this experiment, we will test participant confidence ratings to examine the interaction between participant confidence and performance.

Investigator's Responsibilities:

Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to submit for renewal and obtain approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without IRB approval. Failure to receive approval for continuation before the expiration date will result in automatic termination of the approval for this study on the expiration date.

You are required to obtain IRB approval for any changes to any aspect of this study before they can be implemented (use the procedures found at <http://orc.missouristate.edu>). Should any adverse event or unanticipated problem involving risks to subjects or others occur it must be reported immediately to the IRB following the adverse event procedures at the same website.

This study was reviewed in accordance with federal regulations governing human subjects research, including those found at 45 CFR 46 (Common Rule), 45 CFR 164 (HIPAA), 21 CFR 50 & 56 (FDA), and 40 CFR 26 (EPA), where applicable.

CC:

Farren Bankovich

My Vu

Phil Schnefke

Tara Wagner

Sam Saxton