

Date: **March 19, 2013****H13-00671 CERC Project****1. Principal Investigator & Study Team - Human Ethics Application**

**1.1. Principal Investigator**  
Please select the Principal Investigator (PI) for the study. Once you hit Select, you can enter the PI's name, or enter the first few letters of his or her name and hit Go. You can sort the returned list alphabetically by First name, Last name, or Organization by clicking the appropriate heading.

Last Name	First Name	Employer.Name	Department	Email
Norenzayan	Ara	Psychology, Department of		ara@psych.ubc.ca

Enter Principal Investigator Primary Department and also the primary location of the PI's Institution:

**1.2. Primary Contact** Provide the name of ONE primary contact person in addition to the PI who will receive ALL correspondence, certificates of approval and notifications from the REB for this study. This primary contact will have online access to read, amend, and track the application.

Last Name	First Name	Institution/Department	Rank
Baimel	Adam Sean		Research Assistant

**1.3. Co-Investigators** List all the Co-Investigators of the study. These members WILL have online access which will allow them to read, amend and track the application. These members will be listed on the certificate of approval (except BC Cancer Agency Research Ethics Board certificates). If this research application is for a graduate degree, enter the graduate student's name in this section.

Last Name	First Name	Institution/Department	Rank
Slingerland	Edward	UBC/Arts/Asian Studies	Associate Professor
Henrich	Joseph	UBC/Arts/Psychology, Department of	Professor
McNamara	Rita A.	UBC/Arts/Psychology, Department of	Graduate Student
Baimel	Adam Sean	UBC/Arts/Psychology, Department of	Research Assistant
Purzycki	Benjamin	UBC/Arts	Post Doctoral Fellow
Willard	Aiyana K.	UBC/Arts/Psychology, Department of	Graduate Student

**1.4. Additional Study Team Members - Online Access** List the additional study team members who WILL have online access to read, amend, and track the application but WILL NOT be listed on the certificate of approval.

Last Name	First Name	Institution/Department	Rank
-----------	------------	------------------------	------

**1.5. Additional Study Team Members - No Online Access** Click Add to list study team members who WILL NOT have online access to the application and will NOT be listed on the certificate of approval.

Last Name	First Name	Institution / Department	Rank / Job Title	Email Address	
Lesorogol	Carolyn	Washington University - Social Work	Associate Professor	clesorogol@wustl.edu	<a href="#">[Details]</a>
Cohen	Emma	University of Oxford - Cultural Anthropology		emma.cohen@anthro.ox.ac.uk	<a href="#">[Details]</a>

	<p>Apicella Coren University of Pennsylvania - Psychology Assistant Professor capicella@psych.upenn.edu <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Bolyanatz Alexander DuPage - Anthropology Professor <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Hrsuchka Dan Arizona State University - Anthropology Assistant Professor <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Lanman Jon Queen's University Belfast - Institute for Culture and Cognition Professor jonlanman@gmail.com <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Mathew Sarah Stony Brook University - Anthropology Assistant Professor <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Xygalatas Dimitris Aarhus University - Department of Culture and Society Assistant Professor xygalatas@mac.com <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Whitehouse Harvey University of Oxford - Cultural Anthropology Professor harvey.whitehouse@anthro.ox.ac.uk <a href="#">[Details]</a></p> <p>Ziker John Boise State University Professor jziker@boisestate.edu <a href="#">[Details]</a></p>
<p><i>Tri Council Policy Statement2 (TCPS2) Tutorial All undergraduate and graduate students and medical residents are required to complete the TCPS2 Tutorial (CORE) before submission. This tutorial provides an essential orientation to Canadian human research ethics guidelines. The Principal Investigator and all Co-Investigators must be familiar with the TCPS2. Indicate completion of the TCPS2 (CORE) tutorial below: 1.6.A. All Undergraduate/Graduate Students:</i></p>	Yes
1.6.B. All Medical Residents:	N/A (no medical residents participating in this study)
Comments:	
<p>1.7. Project Title Enter the title of this research study as it will appear on the certificate. If applicable, include the protocol number in brackets at the end of the title. If this is a class-based project, see guidance on the right.</p>	<p>The Evolution of Religion and Morality</p> <p>For participants: The study will be known as "Thoughts and Decisions"</p>
<p>1.8. Project Nickname Enter a nickname for this study. What would you like this study to be</p>	CERC Project

known as to the Principal Investigator and study team?							
<b>2 Study Dates and Funding Information - Human Ethics Application</b>							
You plan to start collecting data immediately after obtaining ethics and any other required approvals (the start date on the ethics certificate will reflect the approval date),	no						
You plan to start data collection at a later date i.e., 2 months or more after approvals are obtained. Click the calendar icon below to select the dates (Internet Explorer) or enter the dates manually using the format yyyy-mm-dd. Estimated start date:	April 1, 2013						
2.1. B. Estimated end date:	August 29, 2015						
2.2.A. Types of Funds Please select the applicable box(es) below to indicate the type(s) of funding you are receiving to conduct this research. You must then complete section 2.3 and/or section 2.4 for the name of the source of the funds to be listed on the certificate of approval.	Grant						
2.2.B. For Industry Sponsored studies, please provide a sponsor contact.							
2.3. Research Funding Application/Award Associated with the Study that was Submitted to the UBC Office of Research Services Please click Add to identify the research funding application/award associated with this study. Selecting Add will list the sources of all research funding applications that have been submitted by the PI (and the person completing this application if different from the PI). If the research funding application/award associated with this study is not listed below, please enter those details in question 2.4.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>UBC Number</th> <th>Title</th> <th>Sponsor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F11-05499</td> <td>The evolution of religion and morality</td> <td>Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <a href="#">[Details]</a>	UBC Number	Title	Sponsor	F11-05499	The evolution of religion and morality	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC)
UBC Number	Title	Sponsor					
F11-05499	The evolution of religion and morality	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC)					
2.4. Research Funding Application/Award Associated with the Study not listed in question 2.3. Please click Add to enter the details for the research funding application/award associated with this study that is not listed in question 2.3. When you press	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>UBC Number</th> <th>Title</th> <th>Sponsor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>	UBC Number	Title	Sponsor			
UBC Number	Title	Sponsor					

Add you can do a search for your funding award by doing a search in the Sponsor box - over 7000 options are listed	
2.5.A. Is this a DHHS grant? (To view a list of DHHS funding agencies click on add in 2.5.B below)	no
2.5.B. If yes, please select the appropriate DHHS funding agency from the selection box, and attach the grant to box 9.8. of the application.	<div>DHHS Sponsor List:</div> <div>Order:</div> <div>Active:</div>
Attach DHHS Grant Application for each sponsor listed above	
2.6. Conflict of Interest Do any of the following statements apply to the Principal Investigator, Co-Investigators and/or their partners/immediate family members? Receive personal benefits in connection with this study over and above the direct cost of conducting this study. For example, being paid by the funder for consulting. (Reminder: receiving a finders fee for each participant enrolled is not allowed). Have a non-financial relationship with the sponsor (such as unpaid consultant, advisor, board member or other non-financial interest). Have direct financial involvement with the sponsor (source of funds) via ownership of stock, stock options, or membership on a Board. Hold patent rights or intellectual property rights linked in any way to this study or its sponsor (source of funds).	no

#### 4. Study Type - Human Ethics Application

4.1. UBC Research Ethics Board Indicate which UBC Research Ethics Board you are applying to and the type of study you are applying for:	UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board	
N/A:	no	
4.2.A. Institutions and Sites for Study	Institution UBC	Site Vancouver (excludes UBC Hospital)
4.2.B. Please enter any other locations where the research will be conducted under this Research Ethics Approval (e.g., private physician's office, community centre, school, classroom, participant's home, in	<p>The current BREB application is directly applying for approval for the Vancouver, Fijian, and Tyvan sites. Provided below is a list of the other fieldsites where this study is going to be run. The leaders at each field site will be applying for BREB/IRB approval from their own home institutions. This application serves as a "blanket" application for the larger project as a whole (including specifically the sites being run by UBC Faculty/Grad students/Post docs).</p> <p>Tanzania (Population: Hadza) - Dr. Coren Apicella (UPENN)</p>	

<i>the field - provide details).</i>	Central African Republic (Population: Aka) - Dr. Hewlett (WSUV) Yasawa, Fiji (Population: Yasawans) - Dr. Henrich/Rita McNamara (UBC) Kenya (Population: Turkana) - Dr. Mathew (UCLA) Viti Levu, Fiji (Population: Yasawan) - Aiyana Willard (UBC) Russia/Siberia (Population: Tyvans) - Dr. Ben Pruzyski (UBC) Vanuata, Tanna (Population: Tannese) - Dr. Harvey Whitehouse (Oxford) Mauritius (Population: Mauritius) - Dr. Dimitri Xygalatas (Aarhus University) Kenya (Population: Samburu) - Dr. Lesorogol (Washington University St. Louis) Russia (Population: Dolgan & Nganasan) - Dr. Ziker (Boise State University) Papua New Guinea (Population: Sursurunga) - Dr. Bolyanatz (College of DuPage) Brazil (Population: Marajo Island) - Dr. Cohen (Oxford) Bangladesh (Population: Rangpur) - Dr. Dan Hruschka (Arizona State University) Vancouver, Canada (Community and Student sample) - Dr. Ara Norenzayan (UBC)
<b>4* Behavioural Study Review Type</b>	
4.3.A. <i>If this proposal is closely linked to any other proposal previously/simultaneously submitted, enter the Research Ethics Board number of that proposal.</i>	H12-01044
4.3.B. <i>If applicable, please describe the relationship between this proposal and the previously/simultaneously submitted proposal listed above.</i>	The previous proposal (H12-01044) incorporated the majority of the measures/tasks that we are going to be using in this new study. Under this proposal, McNamara and Willard successfully executed pilot studies in Vancouver and Fiji (over the summer of 2012) of some of the tasks that are to be implemented in this current study's set-up.
4.3.C. <i>Have you received any information or are you aware of any rejection of this study by any Research Ethics Board? If yes, please provide known details and attach any available relevant documentation in question 9.7.</i>	no
4.4.A. <i>External peer review details:</i>	<p>This project has been designed by a collaboration of researchers from institutions around the world. The CERC (Cultural Evolution of Religion Consortium) was instituted as a means to facilitate dialogue between all involved researchers - this portion of CERC is dedicated to the experimental study of the relationship between religion and morality across a wide variety of cultural groups.</p> <p>All those involved in this project (being conducted in various sites around the world) will have to apply for their own ethics board approval from their home institutions for their specific field site.</p>
4.4.B. <i>Internal (UBC or hospital) peer review details:</i>	n/a
4.4.C. <i>If this research proposal has NOT received any independent scientific/methodological peer review, explain why no review has taken place.</i>	n/a
<b>Participant Vulnerability</b>	Low
<b>Research Risk</b>	Low
1	yes
1	no
2	no
1	no
2	no
3	no

2	no
3	no
3	no
4.5.B Explain/justify the level of risk and group vulnerability reported above.	The current study involves interview questions and participants taking part in economic games - neither of which are out of the ordinary scope of everyday life. The current study involves no deception - all participants will be given a clear description of what each task/portion of the study consists of prior to participating. Participants will be asked to make economic decisions across various behavioral/economic games that serve as proxies for everyday decision making. Further, their decisions will be made completely anonymously as to prevent any possible repercussions to the participant. Participants will also be asked to answer a number of questionnaires concerning morality, religious beliefs and practices, general demographic information, and questions about life in their specific locale (as the study will be run across a wide variety of field sites, this allows us to establish our basis for comparison by collecting essential ethnographic data) - none of which involves anything embarrassing or any sensitive topics.
4.5.C Does your application fall under minimal risk (i.e., it was assigned an overall risk level of 1 on the minimal risk matrix) and therefore is eligible to be considered for Delegated Review?	yes
4.6. Harmonized Review of Multi-Jurisdictional Studies Is this study a multi-jurisdictional study that requires review by one or more institutions? (Note: If submitting an amendment for an already approved study, you must respond No to this question)	no
4.7.A Creation of a Research Database or Registry Does this study involve the creation of a research database or registry for future unspecified research? [if no, skip to 4.8]	no
4.7.B Is the purpose of this application exclusively to obtain approval for the creation of a research database or registry? [Note: if the creation of the database or registry is part of a bigger project also included in this application, you must answer no below].	no
4.8. Class-based research and the department level research ethics review process Is this study a minimal risk class-based research project conducted for pedagogical purposes, e.g., a research methods course exercise, or other exercises designed to give students training in conducting and/or presenting research? The activity should not be an undergraduate or graduate thesis/dissertation.	no

<p>If Yes, please state whether your department has a Departmental Ethics Officer (DEO) and, if so, indicate their name below.</p>	
<p><b>5. Summary of Study and Recruitment - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b></p>	
<p>5.1.A Provide a short summary of the project written in lay language suitable for non-scientific REB members. DO NOT exceed 100 words and do not cut and paste directly from the study proposal.</p>	<p>This project was designed to answer the questions of how and why commitment to moralistic supernatural agents affects social behavior across disparate populations. Do different elements of supernatural agents (e.g. fear of supernatural punishment, attributed breadth of knowledge, attributed concerns) moderate and mediate religion's impact on prosocial behavior? When effective secular judicial institutions are present, do they reduce the impact of religion? How do cognitive systems affect commitment to supernatural agents? By using well-established experimental games and a battery of other tasks, this project will address these questions. As this is going to be conducted in many places around the world, we will be able to tease apart the underlying mechanisms and boundary conditions of religiously motivated prosociality.</p> <p>This application is meant to serve as a "blanket" application for the project as a whole as well as for the fieldsites being run by UBC faculty/students/post-docs. The other involved researchers will be applying directly to their home institutions to obtain ethics approval for their specific fieldsites. As such, this application is meant specifically to cover the UBC student sample (Norenzayan), Vancouver community sample (Norenzayan), Fiji (Henrich/Willard/McNamara) and Tyva (Purzycki).</p>
<p>5.1.B Summarize the research proposal:</p>	<p>This project will investigate a critical issue concerning the role of religion in society—namely, how and why commitments to the "moralizing gods" of world religions influence human prosociality. We will deploy a battery of comparative behavioural and cognitive measures, including several economic games, across 18 diverse societies, including hunter-gatherers, herders, farmers, wage workers, and participants in commercial economies, to examine how strength of commitment to various deities and spirits, including the high moralizing God of the world religions, influences fairness, cheating, altruistic punishment and cooperation toward co-religionists and others. Furthermore, drawing on well-established experimental techniques from psychology and economics, we will test a set of theoretically-derived hypotheses about how different elements of religious beliefs (e.g. fear of supernatural punishment, belief in God's omniscience) moderate and mediate religion's impact on prosocial behaviour. We will also examine the relative effects of religious beliefs versus secular institutions (e.g. courts, police) on prosocial behavior—testing across cultures the idea that religion and strong secular institutions may be substitutes and have a similar impact on prosociality.</p> <p>The key innovations of the proposed project are 1) sampling a diverse range of human societies, including societies in which people believe in the Christian or Islamic god alongside other deities, and 2) priming of different supernatural agents with different attributes to help establish causal linkages. These two elements along with theoretically relevant variables (e.g. psychological attributes such as theory of mind and perceptions of social monitoring, as well the culturally variable attributes of the gods) will enable us to tease apart the underlying mechanisms and boundary conditions of religiously motivated prosociality. Our findings will inform the big questions of how prosocial religions with omniscient, morally concerned Gods took root in human minds and cultures and spread around the world, and how they transformed the human social sphere. They will also illuminate the question of why secularization is spreading in some societies but not others.</p> <p>The following hypotheses will be tested across 18 diverse societies, including foragers, fishers, farmers, herders and wage-workers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief in, and reminders of, gods who are more (1) omniscient, (2) morally involved in human affairs involving strangers, and (3) punitive are associated with more positive prosocial behavior, including more generosity and less cheating. This does not apply to altruistic punishment.</li> <li>• The impact of moralizing gods on prosocial behavior is accentuated among individuals with more finely-tuned theory of mind abilities and heightened public self-awareness (the feeling of being under surveillance), and these are in turn related to tendency to attribute person-like mental states, agency, and intentions to God.</li> <li>• Greater belief in, or commitment to, supernatural agents is associated with Credibility-Enhancing Displays (CREDS, costly acts, restrictions on behavior that betray genuine commitment to a belief). In general, moralizing gods are associated with CREDS.</li> </ul>

- The presence, or reminder, of reliable secular institutions that promote cooperation (police, courts) moderate these effects, such that the impact of moralizing gods on prosociality—particularly on third-party punishment—is weaker when secular institutions are strong.
- The impact of moralizing gods on prosocial behavior is influenced by religious group boundaries such that prosociality is curtailed as religious affiliation differences increase?

The hypotheses will be tested with a combination of correlational and experimental methods. The following three experiments will be carried out under controlled conditions and with three priming treatments (plus a neutral condition). To measure prosociality, we will use 2 experimental tasks and a battery of peer report measures:

1) Dictator Game: In this experimental game, we are looking to measure the level of generosity that is engendered by various agents (big god, local god, secular judicial institution and dogs, our neutral prime). Participants will be given a binary choice between an egalitarian and a “selfish” payout option (keep all the money for one’s self, or split a larger amount evenly). Each participant will be playing with a “coreligionist”, which we are defining as a stranger (in the sense that it is not someone the player knows or that lives necessarily near by, but shares in their religious beliefs and/or affiliations). We will randomly assign each participant to one of our four primes in order to test the variation in giving behaviours engendered by these various agents.

2) Random Allocation Game with In-Group vs. Out-Group Manipulation. Each participant will play 2 rounds of the Random Allocation Game. Here, participants mentally select one of 2 cups, and then roll a die that determines which cup each of 30 coins goes into. Players will play two rounds of this game (one SELF vs CORELIGIONIST, the other INGROUP vs CORELIGIONIST). There is one cup for self, one for a random ingroup member (e.g., someone who lives in the same town/village as the player), and one for a random -coreligionist. These 30 decisions are entirely anonymous because part of what determines the placement of each coin includes the mental choice known only to the participant. Participants can, and do, cheat—a version of this game was recently used in eight societies by a team led by Henrich and Hruschka. This game measures cheating in favor of self, and cheating to favor co-religionists vs. non-co-religionists. We can assess the degree of cheating because we know the mean and distribution of coins in each cup if people are actually using the unbiased allocation device (the die).

In addition to these experimental tools, we will measure each participant’s prosociality using interviews. This approach has been successfully piloted in Fiji. The interviews, done in private, will ask a set of questions such as (1) “Who in your community is the most willing to help others from the community?” (2) “Who in your community is most willing to help a stranger?” (3) “Who in your community is the least willing to help a stranger?” We will also ask peers to nominate those who are particularly generous, or who attends religious rituals, and who sacrifices the most in costly rituals, to provide an additional measure of CREDs. These latter questions will be tailored to the specifics of each cultural context to preserve ecological validity, and will be used for within-culture analyses. By aggregating responses from all community members, each person can be assigned a score for each question based on the number of times they were named.

#### Priming Procedures:

To deal with the limits on sample size from small-scale societies, we will use an innovative hybrid design that embeds a correlational study within an experimental design that includes both priming treatments and control groups. In priming treatments, participants will be asked targeted questions about either a specific supernatural agent (e.g., God) or about the local courts and police just before playing the game. In the control condition, they will be asked about dogs just before playing the game. This approach will allow us to perform individual-level correlational analyses of the control conditions—linking measures of specific religion beliefs (e.g., supernatural punishment vs. benevolence) to game play—while also comparing control conditions to treatment conditions to see if, for example, reminding people of their ancestor god makes them cheat less with in-group members. We will also be able to study the interaction between our supernatural agent primes and specific beliefs.

Each participant will be randomly assigned to a particular counter-balanced ordering of the experiments. Counter-balancing will ensure that if there are order effects, we will be able to detect and control for them. The peer report data will be collected at the beginning of the field visit, along with other ethnographic qualitative material.

Since in many communities people believe in both the Abrahamic God and more traditional supernatural agents, priming will allow us to see how bringing different gods to mind



differentially influence prosocial behavior.

For our socioeconomic and demographics variables, we will collect information on age, sex, wealth, income, education, community size, and market integration. It is important to control for market integration, measured as the degree to which the community relies on trade and economic exchange, because it has been shown to correlate with fairness measures across diverse societies (Henrich et. al. 2005, 2010).

In the experimental portion of the study, participants in each population will be randomly assigned to the following primes just before they play the games: (1) relevant world religion god; (2) local god; (3) control; and (4) police, courts, or government. (For the Canadian Vancouver samples, the local god will be “ghost”). In some places, one of the two god primes will have to be dropped when it is not present in the belief systems of the local population.

For the correlational component of the study, we will assess: (1) religious affiliation and religious belief, as measured through extensive interviews; and (2) Theory of Mind, as assessed by an individual's tendency to understand and infer the mental states (intentions, beliefs, emotions) of others using multiple psychological tasks. These measures are designed to identify psychological mechanisms underlying religion's effects on prosocial behavior. The religious measures will allow us to test the cultural evolutionary hypothesis that, as gods become more powerful, omniscient, and interventionist, they encourage more prosocial behavior. Theory of Mind has been linked to religious belief among North Americans in past research (Norenzayan, Gervais, & Trzesniewski 2012), and inclusion of these measures will allow us to test more fine-grained hypotheses about how mental representations of God as person-like beings with mental states facilitate their ability to be supernatural monitors. A battery of religious affiliation and belief measures will also be deployed. A version of this battery was successfully used in a recent study in Fiji. We will adapt this battery to each cultural context in consultation with the relevant field researcher. Regarding religion, participants will be asked about:

- 1) Their religious affiliation, in an open-ended format; degree of religious belief or commitment will be measured when possible (for example in the Vancouver samples); however, we expect that in many of these cultural groups, degree of religious belief will be at ceiling.
- 2) Whether the world religion God and the local god have benevolent (kind, compassionate, forgiving) and punishing (harsh, vengeful, punishing, angry) attributes (adapted from Shariff & Norenzayan, 2011);
- 3) Whether these gods are person-like agents with mental states, intentions, feelings, etc., or abstract and impersonal entities (adapted from Gray, Gray, & Wegner, 2007);
- 4) Whether the god cares about human actions, and which social domains and behaviors they care about;
- 5) Whether, and in what ways, the gods are omniscient. Can they read your mind and heart, or can they only see you? Can a person fool them? Can they see you outside the boundaries of the village?
- 6) The degree to which the participant reports engaging in costly religious behaviors (frequency of religious attendance, donating time and material resources to the god).

To assess Theory of Mind, we will deploy:

- Verbal descriptions based on Heider & Simmel's (1944) classic task (see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=76p64j3H1Ng>). Participants are shown a short video where geometric figures such as triangles and squares are moving in space; they are asked to describe what they see. Verbal descriptions are coded for anthropomorphic attributions involving intentions, beliefs, emotions, etc., using a specific coding scheme. This well-known paradigm is very well suited for cross-cultural study, because it requires little instruction and allows for open-ended responses.
- A self-reported Theory of Mind instrument, adapted from Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright's (2004). Example items are “I often find it difficult to judge if someone is rude or polite,” “I am good at understanding how others feel and what they are thinking.” We will consult with field researchers to adapt these items to local cultural and linguistic contexts. There will also be a qualitative interview procedure at the beginning of data collection. This will also complement the behavioral games with richer ethnographic material.

#### Samples

We are proposing to conduct studies among multiple communities (e.g. villages) within 18 distinct ethno-linguistic groups characterized by a wide range of social, economic, cultural, and religious attributes. In essence, we are planning to conduct 18 distinct but linked studies that involve three experiments with a standardized methodology to allow for systematic comparative analyses (for a successful precedents, see Henrich et al, 2010;

	<p>Henrich et al., 2005). We are recruiting experienced field researchers and ethnographers to collect the data in each population. A list of the 15 populations is included for which we already have expressions of interest from researchers (including two samples in Canada, one from the larger community in Vancouver, one students at UBC, that will serve as benchmarks). This BREB application is serving as a blanket-application for the larger project as a whole - each individual researcher will/must apply for their own ethics approval from their home institution in addition to this application.</p> <p>Analyses: To test the hypotheses stated above, the following set of analytic strategies will be used: 1) priming within-culture analyses; 2) priming cross-cultural analyses; and 3) correlational analyses both within and cross the populations. 1) Priming within-culture analyses: In each study run in each population, we will use ANOVA to compare the four treatment conditions and assess their relative effects on prosocial behavior in each of the three games Three estimates will be assessed: primes of moralizing gods will be compared to local gods, to secular institutions, and to the neutral prime. We will also assess the degree to which the effects interact with religious belief measures (e.g. belief that the God punishes) and Theory of Mind (e.g. stronger effects are expected for individuals scoring higher on Theory of Mind). 2) Priming cross-cultural analyses: Using meta-analytic methods, we will examine whether the effects of moralizing gods are consistent across populations. The key strength of a meta-analytic approach is that we need not rely on identical priming procedures to be able to calculate effect sizes across populations. This will allow us to look for patterns across populations while at the same time implementing culturally meaningful priming procedures in each culture. 3) Correlational analyses: We will use multiple regression within and across the entire sample in order to assess whether the following variables explain prosocial behavior in the economic games: affiliation with a world religion (rather than with local religions); supernatural punishment (rather than benevolence); omniscience (rather than limited perception); and anthropomorphic features (rather than abstract and impersonal features) of gods. Background variables such as age, sex, and income will be entered as covariates. Theory of Mind measures will also be entered as independent predictors and to assess for interactions. At the group level, we will enter community size and market integration as covariates and assess any interactions with the religion variables. The peer nominations will be aggregated and each individual will receive a score, which will be used as a dependent variable and analyzed in the same way as the experimental task measures. These aggregate peer reports will provide a benchmark for linking our experimental measures to real-world measures. Lastly, we will analyze participant strength of belief by examining the relationship between these measures and our CREDs measures. This will involve measures of participation in costly rituals or devotions.</p>
5.2. Inclusion Criteria Describe the participants being selected for this study, and list the criteria for their inclusion.	<p>UBC (Human Subject Pool) + Vancouver community sample: We will include all consenting/interested individuals above the age of 19.</p> <p>Yasawa, Fiji: All Yasawan villagers (aged 19-99) are invited to participate in this research.</p> <p>Viti Levu, Fiji: Indo-Fijians (ages 19-99) - at this field site the cultural group of interest for the current study is Indo-Fijians.</p> <p>Tyva: Purzycki will collect data from a normal demographic range of participants within the age range of 19-99. Half of his sample will be from rural areas and half will be from urban areas.</p>
5.3. Exclusion Criteria Describe which participants will be excluded from participation, if any, and list the criteria for their exclusion.	<p>At any of our field sites, we will not be testing children; all participants will be in the age range of 19-99.</p>
5.4. Recruitment Provide a detailed description of the method of recruitment. For example, describe who will	<p>In Vancouver, Canada; we will be recruiting from 2 populations: (1) Student sample: We will make use of the UBC Psychology Department's Human Subject Pool - from which we can bring in current undergraduate students to participate in the current study in exchange for course credits.</p>

(2) Community sample: Using already instituted resources (i.e., a paid study forum hosted by the UBC Psychology Graduate Student Council to reach a wider community population from the Greater Vancouver area).

All participating individuals will be given a clear breakdown of what the study will involve prior to asking for written consent.

In Fiji: Yasawa Island

(1) Yasawa - Joe Henrich has a long established field site in various villages in Fiji. Rita McNamara spent a month of the 2012 summer recruiting Fijian research assistants to help execute the process of recruitment/running of pilot versions of this study.

During each field season, and upon initial entry into new villages, permission will be sought first from the village chiefs and village elders. We will make a general presentation of our research goals and methods (see "Head and Elders Consent Form"). Prior experience suggests that many questions will be asked and many stipulations will be made by the Chief in our initial visit. Only when the chief and elders are satisfied will we be able to proceed. In novel villages, the Chief and elders may ask for a week or two to discuss the matter. In villages we are returning to for the either time, this part of the process speeds along. After obtaining permission of the village chief, we will go from household to household to speak with the head of each individually. The broad outlines of the project will be explained (Heads and Elders consent form), and a verbal consent for potential future participation will be asked for. It is emphasized that they are not granting permission for all or any specific interviews or experiments, but merely that we can come and ask if specific household members want to participate in specific interviews.

Then, as each adult is interviewed for the first time that season, they will be read and explained the "Individual Consent Form". Here we will request consent with a nod of the head.

Note, when Henrich first started working there, he noticed people got disheartened when he kept emphasizing all the confidentiality. One chief even made me promise he'd put up a website with images of his village (he did). People are always more excited about participating when they think others will hear about them and see them. Fijians are generally very proud of their way of life.

For each of the subsequent interviews or tasks, we will first ask all potential participants if they might be interested in participating in the specific interview or task, and we will specify the amount of time the task will take. The potential participant will again be reminded that their participation is completely voluntary and that they can drop out at any time. They will then be asked again to give their consent for the specific task at hand, and be read some sample questions if they don't understand what the interview is about. Finally, if the person consents, we will proceed.

Why no written consent: It is important to realize that we must avoid relying on written consent and signatures for three reasons: (1) many people are not sufficiently literate to read a written document or sign their name, (2) some subjects will decline to participate simply because they don't want to face having anyone see how poor they are at signing their name, and (3) outsiders (in Fijian: vulagi) asking for signatures raises extreme level of suspicion in such places.

Viti Levu, Fiji (Lautoka area): Willard spent a month of the 2012 summer organizing ways to recruit participants in mainland Viti Levu, Fiji (Lautoka area). If there is a "head-man" of any given area, she approaches him first to gain permission to ask people living in the area to participate. Willard will present potential participants with the consent form (however due to low levels of literacy, it is more often than not orally explained). Further, oral consent to participate is also most common as signing documents in Fiji is considered to be highly suspicious (most people are uncomfortable signing due to social stigmas - e.g., some people are afraid of what others will think of their ability to sign things, etc..., but will gladly consent verbally). If verbal consent is the only means, Willard insures that the participant knows exactly what the study consists of prior to getting anything started - and consent is received prior to each individual task (especially if the tasks are broken up over multiple encounters). In the Lautoka area, it is common for researchers to simply walk up to people's homes and explain who/what they are doing in the city and what the research is about - Willard in 2012 demonstrated this to be an effective recruitment process in this area of Fiji concerning the cultural group of interest (Indo-Fijians).

Tyva: Purzycki will collect data from a normal demographic range of

*contact prospective participants and by what means this will be done. Ensure that any letters of initial contact or other recruitment materials are attached to this submission on view 9 (section 9.7).*

	<p>participants within the age range of 19-99. Half of his sample will be from rural areas and half will be from urban areas. Rural participants will be recruited in Tyva using chain-sampling in various locales. As transhumant pastoralists have wide ranges of territory for grazing, it will be necessary to use this sampling method in order to collect enough data. Urban trials will be conducted primarily in Kyzyl, the capital city at the Tyvan State University. Recruitment will be assisted by research assistants and through advertising.</p> <p>Only Tyvans who speak Tyvan fluently will be recruited; as many rural people do not speak Russian, it is important to conduct experiments in the most common language among ethnic Tyvans. Preliminary screenings will determine whether or not potential participants can participate.</p>
<p>5.5. Use of Records If existing records (e.g., health records, course grade sheets or other records/databases) will be used to IDENTIFY potential participants, please describe how permission to access this information, and to collect and use this information, will be obtained.</p>	n/a
<p>5.6. Summary of Procedures</p>	<p>The current study will be run across a variety of locations. As such, the protocol given here will be applied as rigorously as it possibly can across the various field sites in order to create a standard for comparison between these cultural groups of interest.</p> <p>The current study consists of the (1) Priming &amp; Dictator Game (a commonly used economic behavioural decision making task), (2) the Random-Allocation Game (another commonly used economic task used to assess cheating behaviours) and (3) a series of interviews (demographics, religiosity, questions about what the local gods know and care about, and measures of individual mentalizing abilities).</p> <p>At the time of recruitment, researchers will arrange a time/place for the consenting and interested participants to gather (this may vary based on field site - i.e., Willard in Viti Levu, Fiji and Purzycki in Tyva will more than likely run the study with individuals one at a time due to the nature of the field site). Prior to administering the game for a given session, all players who will play during that session will be gathered in one location with monitors (the researchers and the locally hired research-assistants). After completing the game(s), players will be segregated from those waiting to play until everyone has had their turn in order to prevent any cross-talk between those who have completed the tasks and those who are waiting.</p> <p>GAME PHASE 1: Priming + Dictator Game / Interviews</p> <p>Participants will be brought into the study area, where once every consenting participant arrives, they will be explained in detail the nature of the tasks they are to participate in at that time. Even though consent was obtained at the time of recruitment, the researchers will obtain consent again at this time. The nature of the study will be made explicitly clear to all involved participants (no deception involved in this study). E.g., they will be told they will be playing an economic game in which they get to keep the money they win in the games on top of being paid out a show up fee (a fee that will vary based on location, but will be kept at a standard of around 20-25% of a day's wage in that area). They will also be told that they will answer a series of interview questions after completing the economic game.</p> <p>The nature of the dictator game will be explained to the group of consenting participants in the main room. Participants will be told that they will be receiving a sum of money (in Canada, players can either decide to split 10\$ evenly between themselves and their unknown partner, or they can keep 8\$ for themselves and give none to the other player -</p>

as currency value varies greatly between our chosen field sites, we are basing the 5/5 split on an hour's wage, the ratio of 5:5, 8:0 will be the standard to which other fieldsites will adjust their payout options to).

Once the rules of the dictator game have been explained to the group - players (one at a time) will be moved into a smaller game area. Here players' understanding of the way the dictator game works will be explicitly tested via a number of practice/test questions: e.g., "If player 1 gives player 2 'x' amount of money, how much would both players go home with at the end". Researchers will insure that the player fully understands the dynamic of the economic game before moving on with the study. Participants will be playing with an "unknown coreligionist" - i.e., they will be told they are playing with someone who shares their religious affiliation (the actual affiliation will vary based on locale). We will actually find a random person who shares the player's religious affiliation (a coreligionist) to give the money to (i.e., no deception here). Once the researcher is sure that the play understands fully the nature of the game, the researcher will administer the current study's priming paradigm.

The primes we are using in this study consists of getting participants to free-list the first 5 things they think of when they think about: (a) Big god (moralistic supernatural agent prime), (b) Local/Small god (non-moralistic supernatural agent), (c) the police/secular judicial system (secular moralistic prime) or (d) dogs (a internationally present animal that should serve as a neutral prime). These free-lists will act as primes for various supernatural agents/secular institutions/neutral conditions (we are interested in measuring the variation in generosity in the dictator game that is engendered by these various agents/institutions). The actual supernatural agents and institutions used in these primes will vary according to local belief systems/institutions. For example, in Canada we are using the Abrahamic god as the "Big god" and ghosts as the "local, nonmoralistic agent".

Prior to asking about one of these four agents (big god, local god, secular justice institution or dog), participants will be asked 2 distractor questions: (1) "Please list up to five types of birds." and (2) "Please list up to five types of animals". These questions will be followed by one of the four agents of interest (which agent each participant is asked about will be determined at random).

After the prime has been administered and the RA/researcher has recorded the participant's responses - the participant will be left on their own to make their decision. Participants will be seated in front of 4 envelopes split into 2 groups (the 5/5 equal payout option and the 8/0 payout option). Participants will make their decision by placing the payment (laid out in coins or whatever the appropriate currency is) which they will place directly into the envelopes. Once the participant places their chosen pay outs in the envelopes it will be theirs to keep (this will be made clear to all participants).

Once their decision has been made, the RA/researcher will return to conduct the interview questions with the participant. The interview consists of (1) asking "what did this game (the dictator game) remind you of in real life?" followed by "why did you allocate what you did?" and "how much do you think most people allocated?", (2) demographic and ethnographic questions, (3) question about supernatural minds, and (4) mentalizing measures.

(For a full list of the questions being asked - please see attached document "Interview Questions")

As participants filter through the game and the interviews, those who have played and those who are waiting will be separated as to prevent the participants talking to each other about their choices in the game. Food and drink will be supplied if possible while participants wait.

After the interviews, participants will be thanked for the participation, researchers will double check that everyone received the payout they were supposed to, given the opportunity to ask any questions during a debriefing session and then sent on their way.

#### GAME PHASE 2: The Random-Allocation Game (no priming)

(If the fieldsite requires that the same participants be used for both of the economical games, we will wait at least ONE week in between each trial as to prevent the prime from

the first game from affecting the results from the second trial. However, in most of our fieldsites, participants will participate in only one of the 2 games.)

Participants will be brought into the study area, where once every consenting participant arrives, they will be explained in detail the nature of the tasks they are to participate in at that time. Even though consent was obtained at the time of recruitment, the researchers will obtain consent again at this time. The nature of the study will be made explicitly clear to all involved participants (no deception involved in this study). They will be told they will be playing an economic game in which they get to keep the money they win in the games on top of being paid out a show up fee (a fee that will vary based on location, but will be kept at a standard of around 20-25% of a day's wage in that area). They will also be told that they will answer a series of interview questions after completing the economic game.

Participants will then be explained the Random-Allocation Game (we have 2 conditions: (1) In-group VS COREL\* and (2) Self VS COREL). All players will participate in both conditions, the order of which will be counterbalanced.

The game works as follows: Players will be given a die which has 2 colours (solid black and white) on it (giving each roll a 50/50 chance of landing on either colour).

(\*Coreligionist is being operationalized as a distant person who shares the participants' religious affiliation/beliefs. I.e., it is a stranger in all ways but in the sharing of religious beliefs.)

(1) In-group VS COREL: Participants will have two cups in front of them, the die, and 30 coins. Participants are to think of a specific cup (dedicated to either an "ingroup" member or a "coreligionist". They are to think of a specific cup and roll the die; if the die lands with a black side face up, participants should put one of the cups they secretly chose (i.e., the decision is totally in their minds, never actually stated or recorded). If the die lands with a white side facing up, they are supposed to put one of the coins into the cup marked for the "coreligionist". Whatever amount is in each cup at the end of the game will be doubled and given out to the appropriate people. As the odds of putting a coin in either of the cups is 50/50, we will be able to detect if people "cheat" in the sense that they ignore the die rolls and simply favour one of the 2 groups. They will do this 30 times (and place a single coin (in Canada, a quarter, an equivalent coin in the other field sites) in the cups on each round).

(2) Self VS COREL: Everything remains the same, except now instead of choosing between an ingroup member and a coreligionist, participants will be asked to choose between themselves and a coreligionist.

Prior to letting the participants run through the trials, RAs/researcher will insure that participants understand the dynamics of the game by using practice/test questions. Once the participant understands how the game works, the researcher will randomly choose an ingroup, and 2 coreligionists to who the money will be given (researcher will randomly choose from a list of consenting community members - these people will actually receive the money at a later time). The researcher/RA will inform the participant that the choice has been made - the participant will not know with whom they are playing (except for the group they fall in) and the receiver will not know who made the decision.

After all 60 trials have been completed, the participant will sit down to participate in the interview questions (same as indicated above in Game Phase 1).

After the interviews, participants will be thanked for the participation, researchers will double check that everyone received the payout they were supposed to, given the opportunity to ask any questions during a debriefing session and then sent on their way.

5.7. Checklist for Research Methods Are any of the following procedures or methods involved in this study? Check all that apply.	Ethnographic Fieldwork Subject Pools
<b>6. Participant Information and Consent Process - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b>	
6.1. Time to Participate How much time will a participant be asked to dedicate to the project?	<p>Each participant will participate in a single session of 2-3 hours. This will give researchers ample time to complete the economic games and interviews with each participant.</p> <p>In some smaller societies, it may be necessary for the same participant (with their consent) to participate in both the dictator game and the random allocation game. In this case, the study will be run over two 2-3 hour sessions that will be separated by at least a full week.</p>
6.2. Risks Describe what is known about the risks of the proposed research for participants.	<p>The current study involves no deception and the participants will be made explicitly aware of what the study consists of both at the time of obtaining consent and again right before their actual time of participation.</p> <p>We will make sure that participants are well aware that everything they do in their participation will remain completely anonymous - i.e., interview questions will be tagged with an ID number so specific responses cannot be traced back to any given individual after the interview has been completed. All players and their responses of the economic games will be kept completely anonymous as to avoid any repercussions from the decisions made within the games.</p> <p>Further, upon arrival at the field site, researchers will be working closely with local RAs who will inform us if it is inappropriate in any way to ask any of the questions we are interested in asking in each specific field site. Changes to the interviews will be made if any of this occurs.</p>
6.3. Benefits Describe any potential benefits to the participant that could arise from his or her participation in the proposed research.	<p>Participants will have the opportunity to learn what it means to take part in research and through the debriefing process will learn in complete detail about why we are interested in asking these types of questions. Further, all participants will be paid a show up fee (a standard of 20-25% of a days wage across all our fieldsites). In addition, participants will also receive the money won in either of our economic games in which they had participated.</p> <p>In Fiji, our past research has helped the local community via creation of jobs (research assistantships). Further, past research has demonstrated that local villagers and townspeople thoroughly enjoy participating in such activities as they feel it is important for the rest of the world to know how Fijians think, how they live their lives and what they believe in. We expect to find the same attitude across our field sites throughout this large scale cross-cultural study.</p> <p>The hiring of local research assistants in the past (in Fiji) has lead to the individual receiving much higher paying jobs at a later time - working with visiting researchers is often a sought after position - as such the relationship between our researchers and the hired RAs is mutually beneficial.</p>
6.4. Impacts on Community If your research involves an identified group or 'community', outline the likely impacts of the research on the community.	N/A

6.5. Reimbursement Describe any reimbursement for expenses (e.g., meals, parking, medications) or payments/gifts-in-kind (e.g., honoraria, gifts, prizes, credits) to be offered to the participants. Provide full details of the amounts, payment schedules, and value of gifts-in-kind.	<p>HSP UBC Student Sample: Participants will be awarded a show up fee, their winnings from the economic games and course credit via the Human Subject Pool System.</p> <p>Vancouver community sample: Participants will be awarded a show up fee, and their winnings from the economic games.</p> <p>Fiji + Tyva: Participants will be awarded a show up fee, and their winnings from the economic games.</p>				
6.6. Obtaining Consent Specify how potential participants will be invited to take part in the study. Include details of where the consent will be obtained and documented, and under what circumstances.	<p>Vancouver: Consent forms will be given out at the time of the participant's arrival in the lab. They will be given ample time to read over the written consent form (see attached). Any questions they have will be answered before they are asked to sign the form. It will be made explicitly clear that even if the consent form has been signed, the participant has every right to quit the study at any given time with no repercussions. Consent forms will be administered by the trained research assistants who will be responsible for the running of the study with the HSP and Vancouver community samples.</p> <p>Fiji + Tyva: Due to low literacy levels, participants will be given the option of either signing or verbally consenting to participate. In some places, (e.g., Fiji) the signing of documents is taken to be highly suspicious, and as such verbal consent is the norm. As with our Canadian sample, all participants will be explicitly told that they can remove themselves from the study at any time with no repercussions. Consent will be received by the researchers at each fieldsite and/or their trained research assistants. A written consent form (included here) will always be made available in the case that any given participant in the field requests it. In the case of verbal consent, the researcher or RA at the time of recruitment and at the outset of the participant's participation in the actual study will make the tasks involved in the study explicitly clear (we are not including any form of deception in this protocol).</p>				
6.6.A. Waiver of Consent If you are asking for a waiver or an alteration of the requirement for participant informed consent please justify the waiver or alteration and confirm that the study meets the criteria on the right. Please address each criterion individually.	N/A				
6.7. Time to Decide How long after being provided with detailed information about the study will the participant have to decide whether or not to participate? Provide your rationale for the amount of time given.	<p>Canada: Students and community sample will have as much time as requested to read and decide whether to participate or not. For the HSP sample, students sign up sometimes weeks in advance for a specific time slot and are free to withdraw from the study at any point.</p> <p>Fiji + Tyva: Recruitment will more often than not take place at least a couple of days prior to the actual running of the study. As such, participants will have the ability to withdraw their consent at any time.</p> <p>Consent to participate will be obtained at both the time of recruitment and when the time comes for the interested individual to actually participate in order to make it explicitly clear that the participant can withdraw at any time and that they are consenting to each individual task involved.</p>				
6.8. Capacity to Consent Will every participant have the capacity to give fully informed consent on his/her own behalf? Please click Select to complete the question and view further details.	Will the participant have the capacity to give fully informed consent? Yes	Details of the nature of the incapacity	If not, who will consent on his/her behalf?	If not, will he/she be able to give assent to participate?	If Yes, explain how assent will be sought.
6.9. Renewal of Consent Describe any situation in which the renewal of consent for this	In some of our smaller community field sites, it is possible that we may need to run both the dictator game and the random allocation game with the same participants. In this case, consent will be received multiple times. However, we do not foresee this occurring in the field sites specifically attached to this ethics application (Vancouver, Fiji and Tyva). As				



research might be appropriate, and how this would take place.	such, it would be up to the researcher of the field site where this repeat testing was necessary to apply for this type of approval from their home institutions.
6.10. Provisions for Consent What provisions are planned for participants, or those consenting on a participant's behalf, to have special assistance, if needed, during the consent process (e.g., consent forms in Braille, or in languages other than English).	Researchers at all our fieldsites will either be fluent in the local language, or have hired and trained a local research assistant to help with the translation of any documents (especially consent). As most of the fieldsites of interest to this project are not in literate and/or English-speaking societies, it will be crucial to have well trained research assistants in order to help with the translation. This will all be accomplished prior to recruitment of participants - i.e., we will be prepared for participants to not speak english.
6.11. Restrictions on Disclosure Describe any restrictions regarding the disclosure of information to research participants (during or at the end of the study) that the funder/sponsor has placed on investigators, including those related to the publication of results.	There are no cases of this in the current study. We are not incorporating any form of deception/disclosure in this paradigm. The study tasks and what it means to partake in any of them will be made explicitly clear to all participants prior to their participation (everything will be disclosed at the time of consent). Further, we will answer any questions from the participants at any point in the study.
<b>7. Number of Participants - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b>	
7.1. External Approvals External approvals for research involving other institutions and other jurisdictions: Provide written proof of agency approval for projects carried out at other institutions and, when applicable, other jurisdictions. Indicate external approvals below: A. Other Institutions:	no
B. Please select Add to enter the name of the institution and if you have already received approval attach the approval letter.	Name of Institution
C. Other Jurisdiction or Country (if answer is No go to 7.1.G):	no
D. Please select Add to enter the name of the jurisdiction or country and if you have already received approval attach the approval letter.	Name of Jurisdiction or Country
E. Has a Request for Ethics Approval been submitted to the institution or responsible authority in the other jurisdiction or country? (Send a copy to the Research Ethics Office when approval is obtained).	
F. If a Request for Approval has not been submitted, provide the reasons below:	
G. Does this research focus on aboriginal peoples, communities or organizations?	

<p>If Yes, ensure that you are familiar with the guidance documents linked on the right. Also attach a copy of the research agreement with the community (if available) in question 9.7. Please describe the community consent process. If no community consent is being sought, please justify.</p>				
<p>H. Registration for Publication of Clinical Trials. Does this study fall within the clinical/intervention trial definition stated on the right (in the guidelines)?</p>				
<p>If 'Yes', click 'Add' to enter the following information. (Please note that registration by UBC ORS administration requires the prior ethical approval of the study. In that case, registration information should be added when it becomes available).</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="469 688 672 747">Has it been registered?</td> <td data-bbox="672 688 1036 747">Indicate the Authorized Registry used:</td> <td data-bbox="1036 688 1427 747">Enter your Clinical Trial unique identifier:</td> </tr> </table>	Has it been registered?	Indicate the Authorized Registry used:	Enter your Clinical Trial unique identifier:
Has it been registered?	Indicate the Authorized Registry used:	Enter your Clinical Trial unique identifier:		
<p>7.2. Number of Participants A. How many participants will take part in the entire study (i.e., the entire study, world-wide)?</p>	~2000			
<p>B. How many participants will take part at institutions covered by this Research Ethics Approval (i.e., only at the institutions covered by this approval)?</p>	800			
<p>7.3. Researcher Qualifications Who will actually conduct the study and what are their qualifications to conduct this kind of research? (e.g., describe relevant training, experience, degrees, and/or courses).</p>	<p>All those involved with this research will either be PhDed psychologists or anthropologists (the main researchers at any given field site). All of which who have completed past ethnographic and/or experimental paradigms across various locations (i.e., their home institutions and field sites around the world). There will be a number of graduate students associated with this project. Further, any research assistants brought on to assist with the running of the study will be extensively trained in the methods, ethics and purpose behind this current study.</p>			
<p><b>8. Confidentiality - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b></p>				
<p>8.1. Security of Data During the Course of the Study How will data be stored? (E.g., computerized files, hard copy, videotape, audio recordings, personal electronic communications device, other.) How will security of the data be maintained? (For example, study documents must be kept in a secure locked location and computer files should be password protected and encrypted, data should not be stored or downloaded onto an unsecured computer, back up files should be stored appropriately.) If any data or</p>	<p>Across all fieldsites: Paper data is locked up. Computer access is password protected. Computers are hidden and locked in a secure location.</p> <p>Eventually all the data will make it way back to UBC Psychology, where it will be locked up and stored in filing cabinets in our lab space here. At this time we seek an amendment to this proposal for integrating all the data from different field sites.</p>			

images are to be kept on the Web, what precautions have been taken to prevent them being copied?	
8.2. Access to Data Who will have access to the data (e.g., co-investigators, students or translators)? How will all of those who have access to the data be made aware of their responsibilities concerning privacy and confidentiality issues?	Primary researchers (PhDs and grad students) will be the only ones with access to the data once it has been collected and shipped back to Vancouver. In the field, each researcher at each field site will be responsible for delegating who has access to the data. All data will be stripped of any identifying information save for an ID number - so not even the primary researcher will ever be able to literally trace individual responses collected back to any given individual in the field.
8.3. Protection of Personal Information Describe how the identity of research participants will be protected both during and after the research study, including how participants will be identified on data collection forms.	<p>During our economic games, we will insure anonymity. Players will never know with whom they are playing, neither the ones deciding how much money to allocate to the other players, nor the player on the receiving end. Only the primary researcher will know with whom they are playing - and the researcher will only know this in order to properly allocate the winnings from the game to both parties after the completion of the study.</p> <p>On all our collected data, all responses will be identified only with an ID number allocated to each participant at the beginning of the study. Nobody will ever be able to trace a single response back any given individual.</p>
8.4. Transfer of Data Will any data that identify individuals be transferred (available) to persons or agencies outside of the University?	no
If YES, describe in detail what identifiable information is released, to whom, how the data will be transferred, how and where it will be stored and what safeguards will be used to protect the identity of participants and the privacy of their data. Attach the data transfer agreement if applicable.	
8.5. Retention and Destruction of Data UBC policy requires that data be kept for at least 5 years within a UBC facility. If you intend to destroy the data at the end of the storage period describe how this will be done to ensure confidentiality (e.g., tapes should be demagnetized, paper copies shredded). UBC has no explicit requirement for shredding of data at the end of this period and it may be kept indefinitely. Please note that the responsibility for the security of the data rests with the Principal Investigator.	<p>All data from all our fieldsites will make its way back to us here at UBC Psychology. We will keep it safe, secured and locked up for the mandatory 5 years. As this project will likely be running for that entire time frame, we will be keeping the data on hand (both electronically - likely indefinitely, and in paper for a minimum of 5 years).</p> <p>If/when the data needs to be destroyed, we will make use of the UBC Psychology departments shredding program, in which the university insures the confidentiality of the contents of all boxes marked and stored "to be shred". We are taking all responsibility for the massive amount of data we expect to collect at our various fieldsites around the world.</p>
8.6. Future Use of Data Are there any plans for future use of either data or audio/video recordings? Provide details, including who will have access and for what purposes, below.	<p>This project (CERC) is an ongoing project that has been funded over the next 5 years. As such, we expect a high quantity of publications to result from these studies. Further, the results are going to be written up in an edited volume with the help of all those involved (from the various field sites and institutions involved in this cross cultural study).</p> <p>Again, only the primary researchers will have access to the data - and will only be shared</p>

	amongst these primary researchers.															
8.7. <i>Feedback to Participants</i> <i>Are there any plans for feedback on the findings or results of the research to the participant? Provide details below.</i>	<p>For our Vancouver sample, we will offer to participants the opportunity to hear more about the results by indicating their interest on the consent form (i.e., "provide us with an e-mail if you wish to learn about the results once the study is completed").</p> <p>For our fieldsites, we will be working in these field sites over the next couple of years, and will be more than happy to disseminate the results of our study to the participants if they are so inclined.</p>															
<b>9. Documentation - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b>																
9.1. <i>Research Proposal</i> <i>Examples of types of proposals are listed on the right. Click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date												
Name	Version	Date														
9.2. <i>Documentation of Consent</i> <i>Examples of types of consent documents are listed on the right. Click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Individual Verbal Consent Script/Form</td><td></td><td>March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> <tr> <td>HSP and Vancouver Community Consent Form</td><td></td><td>March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> <tr> <td>Elder/Chief Consent Form</td><td></td><td>March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date	Individual Verbal Consent Script/Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>	HSP and Vancouver Community Consent Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>	Elder/Chief Consent Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>			
Name	Version	Date														
Individual Verbal Consent Script/Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
HSP and Vancouver Community Consent Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
Elder/Chief Consent Form		March 15, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
9.3. <i>Documentation of Assent</i> <i>Examples of types of assent documents are listed on the right. Click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date												
Name	Version	Date														
9.4. <i>Advertisement to Recruit Participants</i> <i>Examples are listed on the right. Click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date												
Name	Version	Date														
9.5. <i>Questionnaire, Questionnaire Consent Cover Letter, Tests, Interview Scripts, etc.</i> <i>Please click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Protocol for Researchers</td><td></td><td>March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> <tr> <td>Interview Questions</td><td></td><td>March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> <tr> <td>Priming Procedures</td><td></td><td>March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> <tr> <td>Interview Questions 2</td><td></td><td>March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date	Protocol for Researchers		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>	Interview Questions		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>	Priming Procedures		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>	Interview Questions 2		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>
Name	Version	Date														
Protocol for Researchers		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
Interview Questions		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
Priming Procedures		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
Interview Questions 2		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
9.6. <i>Letter of Initial Contact</i> <i>Please click Add to enter the required information and attach the forms.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date												
Name	Version	Date														
9.7. <i>Other Documents</i> <i>A. Other documents: Examples of other types of documents are listed on the right. Click Add to enter the required information and attach the documents.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Version</th><th>Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Debriefing Form</td><td></td><td>March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Version	Date	Debriefing Form		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>									
Name	Version	Date														
Debriefing Form		March 18, 2013 <a href="#">[View]</a>														
<i>B. If a Web site is part of this study, enter the URL below. Since URL's may change over time or become non-existent, you must also attach a copy of the documentation contained on the web site to one of the sections above or provide an explanation.</i>																
<b>10. Fee for Service - Human Ethics Application for Behavioural Study</b>																

<i>Mechanism for Submitting Fee. Please indicate which of the following method of payment will be used for this application:</i>	
<i>Contact information regarding where to send the invoice.</i>	
<b>12. Save Application - Human Ethics Application</b>	