

**California State University, San Bernardino  
Institutional Review Board**

**Application to Use Human Subjects in Research**

**1. PROJECT REVIEW**

All applicants complete CITI Course in Human Subjects Online Training before submitting IRB application (see policy at <http://irb.csusb.edu/>).

- New project (ID # assigned by IRB):
- Resubmission project (Enter IRB ID #):
- Date of most recent previous review:

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 29 2013  
BY: *[Signature]*

**2. DATA COLLECTION DATES:** From (11/01/2013) to (10/31/2014)

Note: Required information; must be future dates (after IRB approval).

**3. INVESTIGATOR(S)** (copy and paste additional investigator names as needed):

G. Bichler      [gbichler@csusb.edu](mailto:gbichler@csusb.edu) on behalf of the students of CJUS 311; fall 2013

*Revised*  
*✓*  
*W/signatures*

FIRST	LAST	email
ANDREW	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
LUIS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
ANTONIO	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
NATHAN	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
JULIA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
MARIA FRANCO	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
YESENIA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
CYNTHIA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
ARLENE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
JULIETA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
SHANE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
EDELMIRA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
RACHEL	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
KELSY	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
JESSE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
GIOVANNI	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
KATHERINE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
NICOLAS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DENIA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
BIENGOLIE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
SANDRA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DANIEL	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
CATHY	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DENNIS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

KRYSTIN	[REDACTED]
BRANDON	[REDACTED]
ELIZABETH	O [REDACTED]
ADOLFO	[REDACTED]
JORGE	[REDACTED]
VICTOR	[REDACTED]
JULIAN	[REDACTED]
SAMANTHA	[REDACTED]
YOSELIN	V [REDACTED]
CHAD	[REDACTED]
JUANITA	[REDACTED]
BYRON	[REDACTED]
BYRON	W [REDACTED]
AARON	[REDACTED]

For students, this research is for:

- Graduate Thesis or Project                       Honors Project  
 Independent Study                                      X Course: CJUS 311  
 Other:

4. **PROJECT TITLE:** Yelping About Management: A correlational study of Yelp.com scores and place management attributes

5. **PARTICIPANTS** (approximate number and all applicable categories):  
Number of participants proposed: **(240 yelp pages of bars/nightclubs and restaurants)**

- Female     Male                                       CSUSB students  
 Children (17 or younger)                               Child Development Center  
 Prisoners                                                       Patients in institutions  
 Pregnant women                                               Faculty or external reviewers

6. **FUNDING:** Project period from (MM/DD/YYYY) to (MM/DD/YYYY)

Are you seeking funding for this research?                      X No     Yes  
If yes, submit one complete copy of your proposal as soon as available.

Does the funding agency require IRB approval?                       No     Yes  
If yes, provide all relevant forms, instructions, etc. with this application.

7. **REVIEW CATEGORY:** Please mark all items that apply.

Note: All research involving children must be reviewed by the full Board.

**Administrative Review** (based on the following categories):

- Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of

- Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
- Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
- Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b) (2) of this section, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
- X Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
- Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.
- Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**Expedited Review** (based on the following categories):

Note: Submit original and one copy of all application materials.

- Collection of hair, nail clippings, teeth (if non-disfiguring)
- Collection of excreta or external secretions
- Recording data from adults using non-invasive procedures
- Collecting moderate blood samples from healthy adults
- Collecting supra- and sub-gingival dental plaque or calculus
- Voice recordings made for research purposes
- Moderate exercise by healthy volunteers
- Study of existing data, documents, records, or pathological or diagnostic specimens
- Non-manipulative, non-stressful research on individual or group behavior

**Full Board Review:** Submit original and one copy of all materials.



Principal Investigator	Signature	Date
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**APPROVAL OF FACULTY ADVISOR OR SPONSOR:**  
 I affirm that I have proofread and reviewed the accuracy of this application and accept responsibility for the ethical conduct of research, student supervision, and documentation maintenance. (copy and paste additional faculty advisor approval signatures and contact information lines as needed below.) I agree to follow the procedures outlined herein for my student(s) and to ensure that the rights and welfare of human participants are properly protected. I will ensure the study does not commence until the study has been approved by the CSUSB IRB or from the Psychology or Social Work IRB committees (administrative and expedited review approval only) and having complied with required modifications. I will promptly report additions, changes, or problems involving the rights or welfare of human participants to the IRB by contacting the Research Compliance Officer at [mquiles@csusb.edu](mailto:mquiles@csusb.edu). If the project continues for more than one year from the approval date, I will submit the required documentation.

Gisela Bichler, Ph.D., Professor, Dept. of Criminal Justice      x75510  
 Printed Name of Faculty Advisor /CSUSB Department      Phone

[REDACTED]  
 Signature of Faculty Advisor      [gbichler@csusb.edu](mailto:gbichler@csusb.edu)      Date

**10. RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS:**

A sampling frame of bars, nightclubs and hybrid establishments will be developed using Google earth, business listings, and Yelp.com reviews. All qualifying facilities in each of the cities selected will be listed. The cities included in the sampling frame are all those cities in which students in CJUS 311, Fall 2013 live, work, or have detailed knowledge of. This list includes the following.

**INLAND EMPIRE:** APPLE VALLEY, CALEXICO, CHINO, CHINO HILLS, CLAREMONT, COLTON, FONTANA, HEMET, HESPERIA, LAKE ELSINORE, MORENO VALLEY, MURRIETA, ONTARIO, PERRIS, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, REDLANDS, RIALTO, RIVERSIDE, SAN BERNARDINO, TEMECULA, UPLAND, VICTORVILLE

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY:** CORONA DEL MAR, LONG BEACH

**SAN DIEGO:** DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO

**VENTURA:** CAMARILLO

For the purposes of this study, premises are defined as having the balance of features (at least 7) as described below.

FACTOR	BAR	NIGHTCLUB	HYBRID
HOURS	12:00 TO 2:00	22:00 TO 3:00	12:00 TO 2:00; WITH SHIFT IN ACTIVITY FOCUS LATE EVENING
MENU	LIMITED	GENERALLY NONE	FULL UNTIL LATE EVENING SHIFT
AGE	VARIES BY THEME/ ALCOHOL OFFERINGS	MOSTLY 18 TO 25	FAMILY UNTIL LATE EVENING
DRESS CODE	LIMITED/ COLORS/TEAM JERSEY	YES	NO
SECURITY	CARDING; SOME DOOR STAFF	FULL DOOR STAFF AND PROCEDURES	NOTHING; CARDING AND SOME LATE EVENING
ENTERTAINMENT	VARIES/OPTIONAL; GAMES (POOL) AND MUSIC (DJ, BAND); SMALL OR NO DANCE AREA	ESSENTIAL (DJ/BAND); DANCE AREA	NOTHING; LATE EVENING MUSIC (DJ/BAND); DANCE AREA
SEATING	FULL SEATING WITH TABLES	LITTLE SEATING	FULL SEATING WITH TABLES; SHIFT IN EVENING
ALCOHOL SERVICE	BAR OR WAIT STAFF	VARIES: BAR; WAITSTAFF; BOTTLE SERVICE	WAITSTAFF
LOCATION/ZONING	RETAIL/COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL	RETAIL/COMMERCIAL
CAPACITY	LIMITED (500 OR LESS)	HIGH CAPACITY	LIMITED (500 OR LESS)
OWNERSHIP	INDEPENDENT WITH SOME FRANCHISE	INDEPENDENT	FRANCHISE
COVERCHARGE	WHEN BAND/SPECIAL GAME NIGHT	ALWAYS	VARIES
DRINK SPECIALS	HAPPY HOURS	SHOTS	HAPPY HOURS

To qualify for inclusion in the study, the premise must also meet the following criteria:

- **Existence:** in operation for 6 months or more under the current management (no mention of new management or change in liquor license)
- **Licensed:** has a current liquor license
- **Operational hours:** is not a special events facility; must have regular hours of operation on a weekly basis

From the master list of 497 facilities, a stratified random sample of properties will be selected from each category of place. This will generate a study sample of 240 premises. Students will be assigned 6 properties (1 nightclub, 3 hybrids and 2 bars; or, 1 nightclub, 2 hybrids, and 3 bars).

11. **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT:**

- Objective.** The objective of this study is twofold: (1) to teach students how to develop a random sample, develop an instrument to code data, and to develop a database; and, (2) to determine whether Yelp.com is a viable source of information about specific management practices of bars and nightclubs that are conducive to crime problems.
- Hypothesis.** Alcohol serving premises that have low levels of place management as reported on Yelp.com reviews will have will exhibit lower Yelp.com ratings and higher levels of crime.
- Methodology.** This study involves examining the content of the ten most recent Yelp.com reviews posted for randomly selected alcohol serving premises. The sampling frame generation process is described above. Each student researcher will be randomly assigned 6 premises. During a designated week, the research team will examine the Yelp.com reviews and code using the data collection sheet (see attached).
- Data collection.** Once the data is entered into a database, the name and address of the premise will be deleted to anonymize the dataset.
- Data analysis.** Analysis will involve bivariate hypothesis testing to explore possible correlations between place management and Yelp rating and reported crime levels.
- Dissemination.** If after this class students want to continue working on this project and write it up for dissemination or presentation they will be invited to do an independent study. Otherwise there is not intended dissemination.

12. **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:** No confidential information is being gathered by this research project. However, to ensure that premises studied are not adversely affected by the study, the dataset will be anonymized prior to analysis. The data will only be available to the students taking part in this class. All students have successfully completed the CITI Human ethics training course. Only aggregated results will be discussed.

13. **RISKS AND BENEFITS:** There are direct risks associated with participation in this project. With this said, it is plausible that researchers will come to view certain premises negatively when they are gathering the data. This may lead them to avoid patronizing, or alternatively, cause them to go to particular establishments over a prior favorite. This change in behavior may actually be a benefit if students learn to avoid harmful situations. It is anticipated that students will become more careful consumers and make better choices in the places they frequent. A final benefit is that students will learn how to do a systematic and critical examination of public information sites like Yelp.com.

14. **INFORMED CONSENT:**  
Informed consent protocol is not applicable to this study as all data are being gathered from reviews posted on a publicly assessable webpage. Yelp.com only posts the first

---

name and initial of reviewers (as the reviewers choose to define themselves) thereby partially anonymizing the comments and since the reviews are posted for public consumption, administering a consent form is not feasible.

15. **DEBRIEFING STATEMENT:**  
A debriefing statement is not applicable to this study.



**Proposed Data Collection Instrument**

Instruction: You will need one data collection sheet per premise.

Property ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

Type: Bar Hybrid Nightclub Avg. Yelp.com rating overall: \_\_\_\_\_ Avg. Yelp.com rating of reviews: \_\_\_\_\_

% of women reviewers: \_\_\_\_\_ % of reviewers from city place is located: \_\_\_\_\_

**Data Collection Step 1.** Look up each of randomly assigned premise and retrieve the following information from the top of the YELP.COM page used to describe the premise.

Item	Coding	Item	Coding
Price Range (example, "\$")		Happy Hour (code: Yes or No)	
Accepts Credit Cards (code: Yes or No)		Smoking (example, "Outdoor Area/ Patio Only")	
Parking (example, "Street")		Noise Level (example, "Loud")	
Waiter Service (code: Yes or No)		Good For Dancing (code: Yes or No)	
Music (example, "none", "DJ", "Live", or "DJ, Live")		Ambience (example, "Hipster")	
Best Nights (example, "Thu, Fri, Sat")		Has TV (code: Yes or No)	

Yelp comment scoring, continued.

Dimension	Item	# of Reviews with qualifying comments	Total Reviews examined
Crowd management, overcrowded (-)	Comments about aggressive crowd behavior, e.g., "elbowed and shoved", "seat jacking", "pushed around"		
Crowd management, overcrowded (-)	Complain about overcrowding, e.g., "unable to move around", "crowded", "no room to move", "dance floor was packed", "long wait for restroom", "Jam packed", "Too few seats, too crowded"		
Crowd management, understaffed (-)	Complaints about long waits for drink or food service, or lack of staffing?		
Maintenance, inside (-)	Comments indicate a lack of cleanliness, e.g., "clean this place up", "bar needs to be clean", "might get a disease", "dingy", "dirty", "spills not cleaned up", "broken glass on the floor", "tables not bussed"		
Maintenance, toilet (-)	Comments indicate inadequate restroom facilities, e.g., "stall doors do not lock", "fluids on floor", "smells like urine", "tissue in sink"		
<i>Dependent Variables</i>			
General agitation	Comments about excessive noise, e.g., "too loud to hear friends talk", "couldn't hear myself think", "couldn't find my friends", "suffocating in the room", "too hot"		
Safety (external)	Comments about safety outside the premise, e.g., "you could be shanked in the parking lot", "no security in parking lot", "car was stolen", "car was broken into", "vandalism", "car was dented/scratched"		
Safety (internal)	Patrons feel unsafe at the location as indicated by statements of "shady area", "take precaution", "be safe when going alone", "place is awful"		
Crime	Comments that it is a hostile environment, there are fights or rough housing and people feel unsafe. Other patrons threatened the reviewers.		
Crime	Comments that there is drug use or drugs for sale		