

---

# University of Arizona Program in Research Integrity Education Monthly Newsletter

---

February 1, 2004

Volume 4, No. 2

---

## *A Message from the Director* *Thomas P. Davis, Ph.D.*

The topic of this month's Program in Research Integrity Education newsletter is "*Issues in Teaching Ethics to Undergraduates*." The Office of Research Integrity (ORI) web site contains *Proceedings* from past conferences that are worth reading, and may be viewed at the web site noted below.

### **Issues in Teaching Ethics to Undergraduates**

The following was authored by:

*Gregory J. Cooper*, Associate Professor and  
Director of the Program in Society and the Professions;  
*David G. Elmes*, Professor of Psychology; and,  
*Jeanine S. Steward*, Associate Professor of Psychology and  
Associate Dean of the College  
*Washington and Lee University*

These and other conference proceedings  
may be viewed at the following web site:

<http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/conference.asp>

For those of us trained to think and work as scientists, our comfort in handling objective, quantitative data makes it especially difficult to imagine ourselves willingly and competently entering into debate about matters of moral reasoning. The task of educating young scientists about research ethics may seem daunting, but consider the disservice done to them by tacitly fostering the belief that scientific research really is managed and executed as cleanly as we would like it to be.

Ethical concerns impinge on the practice of science in a number of different ways. Attempts to incorporate ethics into an undergraduate science curriculum should be clear on differences. In part this is because the distinctions are important to grasp in themselves. In part it is because these different dimensions of ethical influence pose distinct challenges for curricular design and pedagogical strategy.

How can various ethical concerns be best tackled in the undergraduate curriculum? At Washington and Lee University, some science courses include basic coverage of ethical practice, many mentors consider ethical research principles an integral part of training, and an interdepartmental course focuses on bio-medical ethics. Each approach has strengths and weaknesses.

Some ethical norms are associated with the practice of science in a very generic sense. These include: ownership of intellectual property, fraudulent data manipulation, plagiarism, exploitation of assistants, and so on. Because these issues concern all scientific disciplines, they can, and probably should, be incorporated into science classes involving the practice of the discipline. Furthermore, mentors should consider modeling and discussing ethical practice in the same ways that they model and discuss scientific practice. In psychological science, most textbooks on methodology include material on ethical norms. At Washington and Lee such material is included in laboratory sections and evaluated on tests. Students read the web site of the major arbiter of ethics in psychology, the American Psychological Association. If a group project requires institutional approval for its conduct, the students as a group prepare a protocol for the University's *Institutional Human Subjects Research Committee*. Mentors and professors also have available web-based information on the teaching of ethics in other sciences.

Some ethical concerns arise as a consequence of the entities involved in scientific research. We recoil at the inhumanity of the Tuskegee syphilis studies, but not at the mutilation of some sub-atomic particles. Many objects of scientific research have a kind of normative standing that has implications for the ways in which they may be treated in the course of that research.

The curricular implications are (at least) two-fold. First, these kinds of concerns impact the various scientific disciplines differentially. Psychology is more deeply involved with issues of human and animal welfare than, say, physiology, physiology more so than biochemistry, and so forth. Second, the line drawing between ethical and unethical behavior is more difficult in this domain. In part this traces back to controversies regarding the moral standing of non-human animals – can they be treated in ways that humans cannot? Does status on the phylogenetic tree make a difference? In part the difficulty revolves around issues of informed consent in human research. Think of the desperate AIDS patients willing to try an experimental drug before the test protocol has been completed.

Such complex issues produce conflicting opinions and have led to conflicting moral intuitions. The consequence, for curricular design, is that these issues are much more likely to lead in the direction of open-ended and unresolved ethical discussions that the examination of the internal constraints on general scientific practice. Of course the discussion can be brought back down to earth by invoking the explicit standards that have been developed for research subjects. Students take lab courses and join faculty mentors in the conduct of real research, not only to gain expertise in data collection and analysis, but also to learn about the scientific enterprise. Certainly it is worthwhile to help students understand that the design of any study employing, say, human subjects must take certain standard ethical principles into account. Nevertheless, there is no avoiding the fact that these standards embody particular stances with regard to the controversies just mentioned and likely will not satisfy everyone.

The weaknesses of approaching ethics via scientific practice and mentoring alone may best be seen in the final set of ethical controversies. The issues discussed so far involve the ethics of doing science, but some of the ethical concerns relate to the nature of scientific knowledge itself. These problems arise in at least two ways. One is the obligation to put one's knowledge to work to do good when one is (relatively) uniquely positioned to do so. The global warming debate, for example, is fraught with political controversy, charged emotions, impassioned rhetoric, deep misunderstandings of science as a process, irrationality, and so

forth. Whether we overestimate or underestimate global warming, there are significant well-being and economic consequences. A person working in this area might be tempted to steer clear of public debate. Would it be irresponsible, under these circumstances, to simply disengage and make no effort to get the truth out with regard to the global warming threat?

A second question of social responsibility concerns the very generation of certain kinds of scientific knowledge. Many scientists who worked on the Manhattan Project had serious crises of conscience upon witnessing the detonation of the first atomic bomb. Clearly, there is the argument on the other side – if we don't develop it, Hitler will. Would the situation have been different with no Hitler in the equation? Are there things we are better off not knowing? Are there areas of scientific understanding that it is simply unethical to pursue?

Incorporating social responsibility questions into a standard science course might be difficult. Exploring these broader normative concerns typically takes a special curricular vehicle – a special topics course, perhaps best team taught by scientists and others with a background suitable for reflecting on these larger questions of value.

---

## UA Human Subjects Program

### »Highlights«

---

#### Social/Behavioral Science Training Now Available

Alternative training materials are now available for individuals conducting Social/Behavioral Science research. A test based on the Code of Federal Regulations, Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) Manual of Procedures, and the text *Planning Ethically Responsible Research* by Joan Sieber, can be downloaded and submitted to the HSPP office for training certification. *Planning Ethically Responsible Research* is available for purchase at the UA Bookstore and will be available soon on reserve (24-hour checkout) at various UA Library locations.

The Verification of Training form has been revised to reflect the new training and has been incorporated into the new Project Review Form (Social/Behavioral Science).

Individuals who complete or have previously completed training based on the text *Protecting*

*Study Volunteers in Research* (Rochester test) by Cynthia Dunn and Gary Chadwick, have met the training requirement to conduct medical or social/behavioral science research involving human subjects at the UA. No additional training is necessary at this time.

---

**UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA RESEARCH  
AND SERVICE GROUP (RSSG)  
Educational Opportunities**

---

**University of Arizona  
GRADUATE COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT  
Spring Semester 2004**

**Scientific and Ethical Aspects  
of Modifying Human Behavior**

Modern chemistry, biology and medicine in conjunction with the neuroscience revolution are providing tools which can modify basic human behaviors (learning, addictive, aggressive, feeding, etc.). An examination of the scientific, cultural, religious and ethical issues related to this emerging science will be examined. Basic knowledge of chemistry and biology (two years of each) and of social sciences (psychology, philosophy, religious studies, etc.) are useful prerequisites or consent of instructor.

For more information, please contact *Dr. Victor J. Hruby* at 621-6332, or via email at [hruby@u.arizona.edu](mailto:hruby@u.arizona.edu).

**ONLINE FELLOWSHIP IN PHYSICIAN  
ETHICS AND PROFESSIONALISM**

Pursue an Ethics Fellowship...  
from anywhere in the world.

Study at your own pace. Study in your  
own home. Learn online.

The Institute for Ethics at the American Medical Association (AMA), together with the [Medical College of Wisconsin's](#) (MCW) Graduate Program in Bioethics, now sponsors an Online Fellowship in Physician Ethics and Professionalism. This program is a unique opportunity for physicians on Institutional Review Boards, Privacy Boards, and ethics committees or for those who want to learn more about applied ethics.

Our online program is current, comprehensive, and convenient, with courses taught by expert faculty from the AMA, MCW, and around the world. Courses can be chosen to fit your specific interests.

Be a pioneer of online medical learning. Call today. [Get more detailed information on the fellowship.](#)

**HIPAA VIDEOCONFERENCE  
TAPE AVAILABLE**

The Society for Research Administrators (SRA) International Satellite Video-conference from January 23, 2003 is available on tape. It is three hours long, and contents are:

**Part I:** General Confidentiality Issues in Sponsored Agreements, and

**Part II:** Privacy/HIPAA Issues.

To request use of the tape, please contact *Alice Langen*, Director, Research Standards & Compliance, Office of the VP for Research (621-5196) or [langena@u.arizona.edu](mailto:langena@u.arizona.edu).

Also, after viewing the video, please notify the P.R.I.E. office (Ruth Daniels at 626-6282) to receive a *Certificate of Completion* for your files and grant submissions.

**NIH HUMAN PROTECTIONS  
COURSE AVAILABLE**

A free web-based course that will enable physicians, biomedical and behavioral researchers, nurses, and data managers to satisfy the NIH requirements for training about the rights and welfare of human participants in research studies is available at <http://cme.nci.nih.gov>.

The NIH Course on Human Research Protections utilizes interactive modules, case studies, and exercises to cover the following topics: roles and responsibilities of researchers and their key personnel, guiding ethical principles for research, federal regulations, informed consent, institutional review boards, ongoing protections throughout the course of study, data and safety monitoring, reporting of adverse events, privacy and confidentiality, and historical events that have impacted policy and legislation.

**ON-LINE MODULE OR SHORT COURSE IN  
THE ETHICS OF RESEARCH WITH HUMAN  
SUBJECTS**

*The Least of My Brothers*

Funded by the [National Institutes of Health](#)  
(Grant Number 1 T15 AI07601)

*The Least of My Brothers* is an on-line module or short course in the ethics of research with human subjects. Content for the module was developed by the Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions at Indiana University-Bloomington (Kenneth D. Pimple, Project Director; Julia A. Pedroni, Co-Director; Victoria Berdon, Graduate Assistant) in collaboration with WisdomTools, Inc., which

also provided the technical realization of the course. The module is now ready for use by interested teachers and researchers.

For complete information and to review the module at no charge, you may contact <http://poynter.indiana.edu/sas/lb/>. You may also contact Kara Lochridge at: (812) 856-4968, or [klochrid@indiana.edu](mailto:klochrid@indiana.edu).

#### **UPCOMING CONFERENCES/WORKSHOPS**

March 19-20, 2004

**Promoting the Responsible Conduct of Research: What it Means to the Research Enterprise**  
Winston, NC

**Co-sponsors:** Winston-Salem State University, Wake Forest University School of Medicine  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

March 22, 2004

**Does Funding Source Influence Research Integrity?**  
Baltimore, MD

**Co-Sponsor:** Society of Toxicology  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

April 13-14, 2004

**Responsible Conduct of Research in Psychological Science**  
Washington, DC

**Co-Sponsor:** American Psychological Association  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

April 22-25, 2004

**American College of Physicians Annual Session 2004: Ethics and Human Rights Offerings**  
New Orleans, LA  
<http://www.acponline.org/ethics/as2003-04.htm>

May 19-22, 2004

**Eleventh Annual Teaching Research Ethics Workshop**  
Indiana University Bloomington/Poynter Center  
<http://poynter.indiana.edu/tre/workshop.shtml>

June 21-22, 2004

**The RCR Summit: A National Dialogue on Future Directions of RCR**  
East Lansing, MI

**Co-Sponsor:** Michigan State University  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

October 14-15, 2004

**Research Integrity and Financial Conflicts of Interest in Clinical Research: Legal Issues and Regulatory Requirements**

Charlottesville, VA

**Co-Sponsor:** University of Virginia School of Medicine, Center for Biomedical Ethics  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

October 23-27, 2004

**RCR Expo**

Salt Lake City, UT

**Co-Sponsor:** SRA International  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

November 12-14, 2004

**ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity – 2004**  
San Diego, CA

**Co-Sponsor:** University of California – San Diego  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

December 1-3, 2004

**Developing Policy on Institutional Conflict of Interest**  
Las Vegas, NV

**Co-Sponsor:** University of Nevada – Las Vegas  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

December 8, 2004

**Ethics and Responsible Conduct of Research Workshop**

Washington, DC

**Co-Sponsor:** Council of Graduate Schools  
[http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf\\_workshops\\_2004.asp](http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/conf_workshops_2004.asp)

---

#### **University of Arizona Program in Research Integrity Education staff:**

**Thomas P. Davis**, Ph.D. (Program Director)

Alice C. Langen, (Associate Director)

Ruth K. Daniels (Program Coord.) [rhk@u.arizona.edu](mailto:rhk@u.arizona.edu)

P.R.I.E. – Program phone number: (520) 626-6282

*The P.R.I.E. newsletter is compiled by Ruth Daniels.*

---

#### *Words of Wisdom:*

*"Some men see things as they are and ask why. Others dream things that never were and ask why not."*

—George Bernard Shaw