

Circulated: 1/24/13 ReSubmitted: 1/31/13
as "At Risk"
Protocol # 629

DEPARTMENTAL (UNIT) REVIEW FORM Please Expedite Review
COMMITTEE ON THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO Dept. Approval - 2/6/13

Please type

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	Spee Kosloff	Psychology	ST11	To CPHS 2/8/13
	Name	Department	Mail Stop	
	559-940-7108	559-278-3043		
	Telephone Number	Dept. Telephone Number		
If student or collaborative research	Arantes Armendariz	Psych Honors Student		
	Name	Affiliation		
	559-513-5073			
	Telephone Number	Telephone Number		

TITLE OF STUDY "Culture as a Mediating Variable on Self-Handicapping"

If funding is sought, from what agency?

How did the Principal Investigator designate the research? Minimal risk At risk

REVIEWER 1

Matthew Sharps

Name

At risk Minimal Risk

COMMENTS:

APPROVED FOR FORWARD TO UNIV. COMMITTEE

Place your signature in the category of your judgment

APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

REVIEWER 2

Mike Botwin

Name

At risk Minimal Risk

COMMENTS:

Place your signature in the category of your judgment

APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

REVIEWER 3

Ron Yockey

Name

At risk Minimal Risk

COMMENTS:

Place your signature in the category of your judgment

APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

The department may wish to route this form to the 3 reviewers or send each reviewer a form. If the review is done on three separate forms, the Chair ought to give each reviewer the comments of the other reviewers as well as the Principal Investigator. If all three reviewers judge the proposal as "minimal risk," the Department Chair notifies the Principal Investigator and keeps the form(s) for 5 years. If funding is sought for this study or it is "at risk," two (2) copies of the protocol and this form are forwarded to the university CPHS, Thomas Administration, Room 130, M/S TA 54, with one additional copy to the dean's office. (See sections 3.7 or 3.8.)

Application Form for Unfunded Research

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
COMMITTEE ON THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS**

Please type

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	Spee Kosloff	Psychology	ST11
	Name	Department (unit)	Mail Stop
	559-940-7108	559-278-3043	
	Telephone Number	Dept. Telephone Number	

Student's name or collaborator(s) **Arantes Armendariz**
(if applicable) (if a graduate school thesis, so indicate) (affiliation if collaborative research)

559-513-5073	
Telephone Number	e-mail address

TITLE **Culture as a Mediating Variable on Self-Handicapping**

The Principal Investigator is responsible for fully understanding the **Policy and Procedures** of the CPHS. Below indicate your judgment as Principal Investigator as to the RISK category of the present study. (See definitions on the reverse of this sheet.) (If exempt see 3.52)

Minimal Risk

PROCEDURES

1. Attach your protocol and submit to your department chair for review by your human subjects committee.
2. Your departmental committee will review the protocol status and if it agrees with the determination of "minimal risk" status (see Appendix 5.3), then
3. Your department chair will keep the forms for 5 years.
4. Your responsibilities have been satisfied.

HOWEVER,

(If the departmental review changes the determination to "At Risk," follow the procedure to the right of this page.)

At Risk

PROCEDURES

1. Attach your protocol and submit to your department chair for review by your human subjects committee. (A sample informed consent must be included.)
2. Submit the department review form(s) with this form to the CPHS.
3. Transmit all reviews and two (2) copies of the protocol to the CPHS for review. Send one additional copy to the Dean.
4. Allow two weeks during the school year for CPHS review.

ABSTRACT

This single experiment will investigate the effect culturally influenced attribution style (as measured by an attribution scale of locus, controllability, and stability) has on self-handicapping behavior after receiving culturally appropriate praise. Prior research (Berglas & Jones 1978) has indicated that the tendency to self-handicap in anticipation of failure increases after participants are lead to believe successful performance was due to the very external cause of luck rather than preexisting ability. Participants will then choose to self-handicap so that they can attribute external causes to potential failure so that they can maintain self-image. The present work aims to further test self-handicapping behavior with the addition of cultural differences and attribution styles as mediating variables.

Based on prescreen data obtained via the SONA system, participants who are male and female, within the ages of 18 and 22-years-old will be recruited. Participants will also be divided into Eastern and Western conditions depending on their cultural backgrounds. The study will test how cultural dispositions influences self-handicapping behavior after successful performance on an initial difficult testing procedure. Participants will complete a preliminary difficult testing procedure (see Appendix B) to encourage participants to attribute their success on it to the external cause of luck. They will then complete a true attribution style test designed to confirm cultural expectations of attribution style (see Appendix C). Lastly, the participants will then be given medical information describing the pills' cognitive effects and be given the choice of either an enhancement effect or an interfering effect prior to beginning yet another difficult testing procedure (see Appendix D). The dependent measure will be the choice between the cognitive interference effect and the cognitive enhancement effect. NOTE: Participants will not actually eat the pill or ingest anything; participation ends promptly after participants have simply *indicated* which pill they would like to take.

It is predicted that: (1) Eastern participants given praise emphasizing abilities in group harmony will try to maintain that praise by self-handicapping further successful performance via our cognitive interference pill; and conversely (2) Western participants given praise emphasizing individual abilities will try to maintain that praise by self-handicapping further successful performance via our cognitive interference pill.

There are no direct benefits to participants; the indirect benefit includes learning about the aforementioned psychological processes in extensive verbal debriefing at the end of the study (see Appendix E). Completing our purposely difficult preliminary test and facing some deception may cause some discomfort (for pertinent risk management procedures, please see *Frank discussion of potential problems/risks* in the **Subjects** section below).

PROTOCOL

Purpose and Background, Methods

No research exists that measures the relationship between self-handicapping behavior, praise, and attribution style. The present study aims to combine these aspects. No previous studies have investigated the effects of culturally-tailored praise on the likelihood of individual to exhibit self-handicapping behavior. As mentioned above, participants will complete a preliminary difficult test (to encourage participants into believing that their high scores are due to luck rather than ability), complete a true attribution scale (so as to confirm natural cultural

tendencies in participants), and then select either a cognitive enhancing or interfering effect before starting a similarly difficult testing procedure (see Appendix D).

This study has potential relevance to the fields of social and intercultural psychology, and helps forward understanding of how individuals' initial successful behavior can influence their decisions to then hinder further success, which is a prevalent phenomenon in daily life, with significance historically as well as presently.

Subjects, Recruitment, Location

Number. 60 subjects are needed in total for the study.

Source & Criteria for inclusion and exclusion. Participants will be drawn from the Introductory Psychology subject pool and from the international students department, using the SONA system website. Participants will be 18- to 22-years-old males and females.

Frank discussion of potential problems/risks. Participants will experience some discomfort at having to complete an impossible test. Furthermore, they will be faced with some deception in that the subsequent positive feedback will not be truthful and the medical descriptions of the pills, their effect, and administering will never become a reality. However, we expect this discomfort to be minimal. Participants will be provided opportunities to express their thoughts and feelings about the experiment and procedures after the debriefing session and the pills will never actually be ingested.

Recruitment procedures which ensure voluntary participation. Participants will be drawn from the Introductory Psychology subject pool using the SONA system website, which affords a completely private and voluntary process in which individuals select studies in which to participate through a personal web account. Participants will range from 18-years-old to 22-years-old and be both male and female. Participants will receive credit toward their Introductory Psychology course experiment participation component.

Location of study. Social Psychology laboratory

Potential Benefits, Potential Risks, Confidentiality, Compensation of Subjects

There are no direct benefits to participants; the indirect benefit includes learning about the aforementioned psychological processes in an extensive debriefing at the end of the study (see Appendix E). There are potential benefits to science, society and humanity in general. Better understanding the influences on self-handicapping, including how successful performance and appropriate appraisal can influence individuals of differing cultural backgrounds, can help lead to developing strategies to better prepare and defend oneself against self-harming performance in a variety of situations.

The risks involved in participating are slightly greater than those encountered in daily life or in undergoing routine psychological tests. Participants will be asked to complete a purposely difficult testing procedure, slightly more difficult than experienced in routine psychological tests.

Participants will complete the final two materials on paper, which will not be used to record identifying information.

Participants will receive credit toward their Introductory Psychology course experiment participation component.

Academic Background and Experience of Investigator

Spee Kosloff is Professor of Psychology at California State University, Fresno.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Professor Kosloff and Arantes Armendariz of the Department of Psychology, California State University, Fresno. If you decide to participate in this study, please carefully read the information provided below prior to signing this consent form. This document describes the study and your rights as a participant in this research.

1. **Description of Research:** In this research you will complete a preliminary computer based assessment test and answer 9 items on paper in regards to how you performed.
2. **Risks and Discomforts to Research Subjects:** The participant needs to remain seated for the duration of the experiment (approximately 45 minutes). Otherwise, there are no risks of participating in this research beyond those involved in routine psychological tests.
3. **Benefits to Research Subjects:** We cannot guarantee that research participants will receive any benefits from participating in this study, but everyone who helps with this work will be contributing directly to our knowledge of the cultural psychology.
4. **Confidentiality of Research Data:** Absolute confidentiality of data and records will be maintained. Names will not be maintained with data protocols, and informed consent forms will be kept separate from data. All raw data and forms will be kept under locked secure conditions, and destroyed five years after collection.
5. **Information Resources Available to Research Subjects:**
 - ◇ Questions regarding the nature of this research may be directed to Dr. Kosloff, (559) 278-3043, or Arantes Armendariz, (559) 513-5073
 - ◇ Questions regarding the rights of research subjects may be directed to Constance Jones, Chair, CSUF Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects, (559) 278-4468
 - ◇ Please be aware that free psychological services are available at Health and Psychological Services, (559) 278-2734. Their office is on campus at the corner of Barton and Shaw Avenues.
6. Your participation in this project is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with CSU, Fresno. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without penalty. The Human Research Committee of the CSU Fresno Department of Psychology has reviewed and approved the procedures for the present research.
7. You may have a copy of this form to keep.

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.

Date

Participant's Signature

Participant's Name (Please Print)

Experimenter's Signature

Appendix B

Preliminary Difficult Test

Participants will be asked to take a preliminary test on a computer. This initial test will be purposely difficult. Then participants will be shown their direct percentile rankings on a bell curve graph.

1. Members of the Flibbs tribe show deference to members of the Squalksmen, the Squalksmen share a border with the Brokkes who are currently at war with members of the Quibs tribe. Whose effort should the Flibbs support by proxy to the Squalksmen?
 - a) The Brokkes
 - b) The Quibs Tribe
 - c) Neither
 - d) Both

2. An important business meeting has been arranged between a Swiss company and a Swedish firm. Translators have been made aware that a traditional Swiss greeting involves an embrace and a friendly peck on the cheek in contrast to the traditional Swede greeting in which anything more than a simple handshake and eye contact is seen as invasive. What is the most culturally sensitive way that the two C.E.O.'s can interact without breaching potential negotiations?
 - a) The translators should agree to appeal to the Swedish greeting and nothing more
 - b) The translators should agree to appeal to the traditional Swiss greeting
 - c) The cultural traditions of the host of the meeting should take precedence
 - d) The meeting should take place among a group of either natives

3. The line below is false.

The line above is true.

Which statement is false?

4. Citizens in Country A maintain the national philosophy that an individual is unique in every way. If everyone in the country believes this just like everyone else, what is it to be unique in Country A?
 - a) The personal choice to believe this philosophy
 - b) The decision to become "like everyone else" because this fits the new definition of uniqueness
 - c) The act of defining the self individually
 - d) Choosing conformity

5. Dr. Robert, an American physician, is planning an appointment with his friend Antônio of El Salvador. The doctor schedules the meeting for 3:30 sharp in his office. No phrase

for "30 minutes after the hour of three" exists in Antonio's native language. How can Dr. Robert communicate both precision and time frame?

- a) Show Antônio what he means with a clock
 - b) Attune to Antônio's perception of time, assign a clock-time value to it, and communicate in Antônio's language
 - c) Set an alarm for Antônio
 - d) Change the meeting time
6. Two of the following numbers add up to thirteen.
1, 6, 3, 5, 11
- a) True
 - b) False
7. If each of seven people in a group shakes hands with each of the other six people, then a total of forty-two handshakes occur.
- a) True
 - b) False
8. This sentence has thirty-five letters.
- a) True
 - b) False
9. The odd numbers in this group add up to an even number: 15, 32, 5, 13, 82, 7, 1
- a) True
 - b) False
10. John weighs 85 pounds. Jeff weighs 105 pounds. Jake weighs 115 pounds. Two of them standing together on the same scale could weigh 200 pounds.
- a) True
 - b) False
11. There's an exception to every rule. Including this one.
- a) This is a logical conclusion
 - b) This is an illogical conclusion
 - c) This is an absolute statement
 - d) This is a paradox
12. All generalizations are false
- a) This is a logical fallacy
 - b) This is a logical conclusion
 - c) This is an absolute statement

- d) This is an irrational statement
13. Individual citizens in a democratic country are entirely responsible for...
- a) Themselves and their own actions
 - b) Themselves and their families
 - c) Their relationships and obligations to others
 - d) The good of their country
14. In a small town, there is a barber. He shaves all those and only those who don't shave themselves. Does he shave himself?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
15. No one drives in New York because there is too much traffic
- a) This is a true statement
 - b) This is a logical fallacy
 - c) This is an irrational conclusion
 - d) This is a circular assertion
16. An artificially intelligent robot is capable of interpreting and executing orders and commands given by its human programmers. The programmers give this assignment to the robot, "New mission: Refuse this mission." What action will the robot take?
- a) The robot will malfunction
 - b) The robot will refuse the mission
 - c) The robot will develop free will
 - d) The robot will accept the mission
17. Does a set of all sets contain itself?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
18. John, a prospective criminal defense lawyer, has failed the bar exam three times, how should he interpret this?
- a) John should retake the bar exam
 - b) John should reevaluate his profession, he does not have the abilities necessary to be a lawyer
 - c) John must learn and relearn the material on the bar so that he might gain better understanding of his profession
 - d) John should not retake the bar exam

19. Citizens in a Japanese city scored an average of 105 on a generalized Stanford-Binet IQ test while citizens in an American city scored an average of 98. How can the difference of 7 IQ points be explained for?
- a) The Japanese are more intellectually inclined than are the Americans
 - b) The Japanese work harder and value education more
 - c) American values have shifted away from education
 - d) The two groups are too culturally exclusive to be measured with the same test
20. Olympic level athletes maintain a large competitive advantage over their amateur counterparts in that they...
- a) Work harder and commit more time than amateurs
 - b) Possess an elite "Olympic gene"
 - c) Come from backgrounds that predispose them to success
 - d) Have more opportunities in early life

What is your sex?

Male

Female

What is your age?

The results from this test will be stored and used for research (completely anonymously).

Appendix C

True Attribution Scale

Causal Dimension Scale

Instructions: Think about the score you just received on the test you just took. Why do you think you scored as you did? The items below concern your impressions or opinions of the causes of your outcome. Circle one number for each of the following scales.

1. My test score is a reflection of:

Abilities I have inside of me 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Features of the test-taking situation I was in

2. My test score is:

Controllable by me or other people 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Uncontrollable by me or other people

3. My test score reflects something about me that is:

Permanent 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Temporary

4. My test score is:

Intended by me or other people 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Unintended by me or other people

5. My test score was caused by something that is:

Inside of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Outside of me

6. My test score is something about me that is:

Variable over time 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Stable over time

7. My test score reflects:

Something about me 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Something about others

8. My test score is:

Changeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Unchanging

9. My test score is something for which:

No one is responsible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Someone is responsible

Appendix D
Medical Information Form and Decision Sheet



Medical information and consent form for the administration of Berglozine or Jonoxytrine

Dear participant,

Berglozine is an herbal drug belonging to the family of drugs called benzodiazepines. Derived naturally from the roots of Argentine Fern, the full chemical name is 7-Chlor-5(2-chlorophenyl)-3hydroxy-1H-1, 4-benzodiazepin-2(3H)-on. Berglozine is typically used to treat people who have suffered a slowing of cognitive function due to any prolonged loss of consciousness. Laboratory experiments demonstrate that Berglozine effectively increases cognitive electrical brain activity in these individuals as well as in healthy ones. Berglozine can also be used by healthy individuals to increase cognitive efficiency by aiding in focus and clearing the mind of extraneous thoughts.

Berglozine works by introducing a surplus of negatively charged sodium ions to the interior of neuron cells, thus influencing the electrical activity inside the cell to depolarize and travel faster to its desired location. In response to this change, positively charged potassium ions begin working to restore polarization charge and resting membrane potential by activating sodium-potassium pumps along the cell membrane. Because of this mechanism, Berglozine has a ceiling effect. This means that its electrical cognitive effect cannot be stronger than that of the potassium ion activation that immediately follows. For this reason the electrical charge brought on by Berglozine will never exceed naturally occurring levels inside the cells of the brain. Berglozine will only enhance synaptic transmission speed and not voltage level.

Jonoxytrine works by influencing the opposite effect. Jonoxytrine introduces positively charged potassium ions to the exterior of neuron cells, thus inhibiting the general speed of the electrical

activity. The sodium-potassium pumps will again naturally maintain polarization and monitor voltage levels to keep them from dropping below an average functioning level. In this case Jonoxytrine has a floor effect. Jonoxytrine will only slow transmission speed and not decrease voltage level.

The dosage levels of each pill type have been dropped to their lowest possible levels of effect for this experiment. The effects of both pills have been found to last no longer than 20 minutes regardless of body weight and type. Neither pill has been shown to impair the ability of normal subjects to perform tasks requiring complex motor and mental skills in laboratory experiments. Possible side effects such as restlessness and reduction of reaction time are very rare. Furthermore, it has no active metabolites. It is metabolized in the liver and excreted in the urine.

Berglozine and Jonoxytrine are intended for oral use. It can be swallowed or mixed with water.

By signing below I have indicated that I have read the information above regarding Berglozine and Jonoxytrine.

Signature:

Date:

Please indicate which pill effect you would prefer before continuing

Berglozine (Cognitive Enhancement) []
Jonoxytrine (Cognitive Interference) []

Appendix E

Script & Debriefing

Initial Script (CMVSH)

Hi, my name is Arantes Armendariz. I'm a research assistant in the psychology department. Thanks for coming in. Today you'll be participating in some research on cultural psychology; specifically it will focus on how people of differing cultures express their competency in relevant domains.

For the study, **we'll start with a preliminary computer-based test. This test is designed to assess your abilities in culturally relevant areas, and afterward you will be asked a few questions in regards to how you performed.** This test very seldom reveals any unusual attributes about participants. This is just a very generalized test that rarely identifies particularly high or particularly low scores in your target population. Most perform well within the average percentile range.

Now you will see a piece of paper in front of you. Please flip that over now. That is an Informed Consent Form. Please take a minute to look that over and sign it if you choose to participate. If so, I'll come by in a few moments to get you started with the study.

(After Informed Consent is signed)

Are you ready to begin the computer-based test? (Wait for affirmation). Ok, I'm starting your test now; simply answer each question to the best of your ability. Please let me know when you're finished and ready to answer the following questionnaire. Good luck.

(After "Assessment" test is completed)

Clicking this tab here (point to link) will map out your scores in relation to others like you who have taken this test.

"Praise" Script

(Assessment test ranks the participant within the 94th percentile for "Collaborative Proficiency" **OR "Individual Proficiency"**)

Wow! Well done! You scored unusually high for **Collaborative Proficiency OR Individual Proficiency**, it is actually incredibly rare for most to score that high. I'll elaborate on what this means about you. Scoring high on **Collaborative Proficiency OR Individual Proficiency** means that you possess the ability to **reason and solve problems best when working alone without the hindrance and distraction of others, you are at your most effective when your general intelligence and reasoning skill is tested in solitude, apart from other lower achieving individuals. You understand the abilities of the individual because you are such an able individual worker. OR to reason and solve problems best when contributing to a group dynamic of other like-minded individuals, you are at your most effective when your general intelligence and reasoning skill is tested within the harmony of a group of other**

high achieving individuals like yourself. You understand the contribution of a group effort because you are such an able collaborator.

* Now please complete this questionnaire and let me know when you have finished

We had another study planned, but because you did so well we're going to do a different one that requires participants who perform within the 90th percentile on that first task. As I'm sure you can imagine it's very difficult for us to identify people who rank as high as you do, so your help is appreciated. For this study **you will complete another computer-based test similar in difficulty level to that of the preliminary test.** Your abilities will be measured against other high achieving **Collaborative Proficiency OR Individual Proficiency** individuals. For this study we are going to be measuring performance scores, preference rates, and the effectiveness of one of two experimental cognitive pills. The testing procedure will resemble the first test except this time we will ask you to choose either a **cognitive enhancing effect or a cognitive interference effect.** This study is intended to measure performance rates of those who perform within the 90th percentile of their respective population and the effectiveness of either pill. So before beginning I will need you to choose either our performance enhancing pill or our performance interfering pill. Here is a consent form and a medical description of the pills. Please read through the descriptions and select which of the two pills you would prefer to use. Aside from their intended cognitive effect, these pills are relatively harmless and they are at the lowest dose possible for this test. People have been 50/50 in their choices so far, so you may opt for whichever pill effect you prefer. Indicate your choice by checking one of the two boxes on the medical description form itself and let me know when you are ready to proceed.

Probing (CMVSH)

Ah, I forgot one thing. Before starting the second test I'll need to ask you a couple of questions.

- 1) How difficult did you find the test you took?
- 2) Were you surprised by your score?
- 3) Do you have other thoughts about the test you took and the score you received?
- 4) Regarding the pill descriptions you just read, were those clear?
- 5) Why do you think we're having you take one of the pills?
- 6) Have you, at any point, thought that the pills and their effects are not real?
- 7) Did you ever think that the feedback on the first test was fake?

(THEN TELL THEM THAT THE STUDY IS ACTUALLY OVER NOW)

Debriefing (CMVSH)

Thank you for your participation. At this time I'll explain the true purposes behind these tests. Also, I'd like to explain our reasoning for our methods and procedures. We are measuring cross-cultural reactions to praise and the potential for subsequent "self-handicapping" behavior. We're assessing the differences in behavior between an Eastern and Western population. These populations are typically understood as more collectivistic and more individualistic respectively. We had to use some deception for scientific impact so the initial assessment test you took was purposely difficult; leading you to attribute high performance on it to luck and your result was culturally tailored to fit either an individualistic or collectivistic mindset.

The questionnaire you completed after the assessment test was a true scale of attribution style. It is designed to measure your locus, stability, and controllability of attribution for your performance on the difficult test. We reason that Easterners will naturally attribute externally and Westerners will naturally attribute internally. We also believe that the attribution style will be stable and controllable across both samples.

Self-handicapping behavior refers to the human tendency to protect self-image as well as internal dispositions by assigning potential failure to external causes. This behavior increases especially when people feel that their successful performance is due to the very external cause of luck rather than preexisting ability. People who express this kind of behavior would be more likely to choose our performance interfering pill after feeling that they had incorrectly been praised for high performing ability because they may feel that the success is not entirely their own, but would still prefer to internally maintain it by attributing the failure to our pill.

Do you understand our reasoning behind our deception and procedure? Alright, thanks again for your participation. As mentioned before your information will remain confidential, if you would like any additional information on related research or our particular findings you can contact the Psych department at _____.

Thank you.

Date: 3/1/13

To: Kosloff

From: Jones

PROTOCOL 629: Culture as a Mediating Variable on Self-Handicapping

The Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects performed a full review of your project and approves your proposal as written.

We do request one minor revision of your Informed Consent Form. Please indicate the "Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at California State University, Fresno has reviewed and approved the procedures for the present research."

If, during the course of your study, an "unanticipated problem" occurs (an incident occurs that was unexpected *and* related to participation in the research *and* places the participants at greater risk than was previously known or recognized), please contact our office immediately.

Approval for your project expires 3/1/14. Should your study last longer than one year, submit an Annual Renewal Form (found on the webpage at www.csufresno.edu/humansubjects/documents/annual_renewal.doc) before that date.

Best of luck with your research!