Research Ethics in Psychology

Psych 323
Professor Compton
Fall 2022
Mon 11:30-1:00

Course description:

The purpose of this seminar is to examine ethical issues that arise in the conduct of psychological research. Issues covered will include some that are common to all sciences (e.g., scientific integrity, data manipulation, intellectual property) as well as those more specific to psychological research (e.g., protection of and respect for diverse human and nonhuman research participants).

Course objectives:

Students will gain an appreciation of the societal context in which psychological research is conducted, and will deepen their understanding of the principle that to do research well means to do research ethically.

Grading requirements and expectations:

25% discussion questions for each class period

- Students will be expected to submit an original discussion question based on the reading by noon the day before the seminar meets. These student-generated DQs will be used to guide discussion in class.
- Students are expected to submit DQs for 10 of the 11 class periods in Weeks 3 – 13; student decides which week to skip without penalty
- DQs will be graded on a 3-point basis (3 points = original/insightful; 2 = satisfactory; 1 = shows little evidence of reflection on reading).

25% leading discussion for one assigned class period

- Responsibilities include assembling DQs on handout for class; guiding class through discussion; bringing in some new element, such as video or additional handout/activity
- Graded on 4.0 scale

25% active participation in all other class periods

- graded on 3-point scale; 3 = consistently engaged and reflective; 2 = generally good but inconsistently engaged, or reflections are not consistently pertinent or clearly expressed; 1 = not much contribution to discussion

25% final paper analyzing ethics of a classic or controversial study in psychology

- ~8 pages, due at end of finals period
- Graded on 4.0 scale

Schedule and Reading List

A. Scientific Integrity

- Week 1 (8/29): Introduction: Why Do We Need Ethics Training in Science?
- Week 2 (9/5): Labor Day – no class
- Week 3 (9/12): Data Fabrication and Misrepresentation
    - LaCour, M.J., & Green, D.P. (2014). When contact changes minds: An experiment on transmission of support for gay equality. *Science*, *346*, 1366-1369. [*with editor's published retraction*]
    - Konnikova, M. (2015, May 22). How a gay marriage study went wrong. *The New Yorker*.
    - Stapel, D. A., & Lindenberg, S. (2011). Coping with chaos: How disordered contexts promote stereotyping and discrimination. *Science*, *332*(6026), 251-253. [*with author's published retraction*]
    - Callaway, E. (2011). Report finds massive fraud at Dutch universities. *Nature*, *479*, 15.
    - Sternberg, R.J., & Fiske, S.T., Eds. (2015). Excerpts from Part VII: Fabricating data. In *Ethical Challenges in the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Week 4 (9/19): Authorship, Intellectual Property, and Peer Review
    - Macrina, F.L. (2014). Authorship and peer review. *Scientific Integrity, 4th ed*. (pp. 83-134). Herndon, VA: ASM Press.
    - Sternberg, R.J., & Fiske, S.T., Eds. (2015). Excerpts from Part III: Authorship and credit. In *Ethical Challenges in the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
    - Dworkin, J.D., et al. (2020). The extent and drivers of gender imbalance in neuroscience reference lists. *Nature Neuroscience*, *23*(8), 918-926.
    - Kolata, G. (2017 October 30). Many academics are eager to publish in worthless journals. *New York Times*.
- Week 5 (9/26): Open Science Movement
    - Nosek, B. A., & Bar-Anan, Y. (2012). Scientific utopia: I. Opening scientific communication. *Psychological Inquiry*, *23*(3), 217-243. [*Plus extensive commentary in same issue—OK to skim]*.
    - Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*(6), 615-631.
    - Popkin, G. (2019). Data sharing and how it can benefit your scientific career. *Nature*, *569*(7756), 445-447.
    - Fox, J., et al. (2021). Open science, closed doors? Countering marginalization through an agenda for ethical, inclusive research in communication. *Journal of Communication*, *71*(5), 764-784.

B. External Forces Operating on Science

- Week 6 (10/3): Political Pressures

    - Nisbet, E. C., Cooper, K. E., & Garrett, R. K. (2015). The partisan brain: How dissonant science messages lead conservatives and liberals to (dis)trust science. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *658*(1), 36-66.
    - Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political diversity in social and personality psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*(5), 496-503. [*plus commentary*]
    - Reinero, D. A., et al. (2020). Is the political slant of psychology research related to scientific replicability? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(6), 1310-1328.

- Week 7 (10/17): Industry and Economic Pressures

    - Brownell, K.D. (2015). The power of industry (money) in influencing science. In R.J. Sternberg & S.T. Fiske, Eds. (2015). *Ethical Challenges in the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* (pp. 197-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.
    - Perlis, R. H., et al. (2005). Industry sponsorship and financial conflict of interest in the reporting of clinical trials in psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 162,* 1957-1960.
    - Botkin, J. R. (2018). Should failure to disclose significant financial conflicts of interest be considered research misconduct? *JAMA*, *320*(22), 2307-2308.
    - Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). Psychology's replication crisis and the grant culture: Righting the ship. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(4), 660-664.
    - Berman, E.P. (2012). Academic science as an economic engine. In *Creating the Market University: How Academic Science Became an Economic Engine* (pp. 1-18). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Week 8 (10/24): Science and the Media

    - Franzen, M., Weingart, P., & Rödder, S. (2012). Exploring the impact of science communication on scientific knowledge production: An introduction. In *The Sciences' Media Connection–Public Communication and Its Repercussions* (pp. 3-14). Springer Netherlands.
    - Peters, H. P. (2013). Gap between science and media revisited: Scientists as public communicators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *110*(Supplement 3), 14102-14109.
    - Koh, E. J., Dunwoody, S., Brossard, D., & Allgaier, J. (2016). Mapping neuroscientists' perceptions of the nature and effects of public visibility. *Science Communication*, *38*(2), 170-196.
    - Merchant, R. M., & Asch, D. A. (2018). Protecting the value of medical science in the age of social media and "fake news". *JAMA*, *320*(23), 2415-2416.

C. Research Participants

- Week 9 (10/31): Regulatory Oversight – IRB and its History

    - Speiglman, R., & Spear, P. (2009). The role of institutional review boards: Ethics: Now you see them, now you don't. In D.M. Mertens and P.E. Ginsberg, Eds. *Handbook of Social Research Ethics* (pp. 121-134). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
    - Grady, C. (2010). Do IRBs protect human participants? *JAMA*, *304*, 1122-1123.
    - Klitzman, R. (2011). The ethics police? IRBs' views concerning their power. *PLoS One*, *6*, e28773.
    - Babb, S. (2021). The privatization of human research ethics: an American story. *European Journal for the History of Medicine and Health*, *78*(2), 392-411.

- Week 10 (11/7): Informed Consent, Deception, and Vulnerable Populations

    - von Hippel, W. (2015). Ethically questionable research. In R.J. Sternberg & S.T. Fiske, Eds. *Ethical Challenges in the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* (pp. 155-156). New York: Cambridge University Press.
    - Israel, M. (2014). Informed consent. In *Research Ethics and Integrity for Social Scientists: Beyond Regulatory Compliance* (pp. 146-183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
    - Kimmel, A.J. (2012). Deception in research. In S.J. Knapp, Ed., *APA Handbook of Ethics in Psychology, v.2: Practice, Teaching, and Research* (pp. 401-421). Washington, DC: APA.
    - Sieber, J.E. (2012). Research with vulnerable populations. In S.J. Knapp, Ed., *APA Handbook of Ethics in Psychology, v.2: Practice, Teaching, and Research* (pp. 371-384). Washington, DC: APA.

- Week 11 (11/14): Diversity in Research Participants

    - Roberts, S. O., et al. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(6), 1295-1309.
    - Dupree, C. H., & Kraus, M. W. (2022). Psychological science is not race neutral. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *17*(1), 270-275.
    - Kahalon, R., et al. (2022). Mentioning the sample's country in the article's title leads to bias in research evaluation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *13*(2), 352-361.
    - Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist*, *76*(1), 116.
    - Waheed, W., et al. (2015). Overcoming barriers to recruiting ethnic minorities to mental health research: a typology of recruitment strategies. *BMC Psychiatry*, *15*(1), 101.

- Week 12 (11/21): Ethical Issues in Cross-Cultural Research

    - Matsumoto, D., & Jones, C.A.L. (2009). Ethical issues in cross-cultural psychology. In D.M. Mertens and P.E. Ginsberg, Eds. *Handbook of Social Research Ethics* (pp. 323-336). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
    - Broesch, T., et al. (2020). Navigating cross-cultural research: methodological and ethical considerations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, *287*(1935), 20201245.

- Urassa, M., et al. (2021). Cross-cultural research must prioritize equitable collaboration. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(6), 668-671.
- LaFrance, J., & Crazy Bull, C. (2009). Researching ourselves back to life: Taking control of the research agenda in Indian Territory. In D.M. Mertens and P.E. Ginsberg, Eds. *Handbook of Social Research Ethics* (pp. 135-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Week 13 (11/28): Ethics of Animal Research

  - Gluck, J.P. (2016). Excerpts from *Voracious Science & Vulnerable Animals: A Primate Scientist's Ethical Journey*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
  - Stangroom, J. (2005). Animal experimentation, ethics, and medical research: In conversation with Colin Blakemore. *What Scientists Think*. London: Routledge.
  - DeGrazia, D., & Beauchamp, T. L. (2019). Beyond the 3 Rs to a more comprehensive framework of principles for animal research ethics. *ILAR Journal*, *60*(3), 308-317.

D. Week 14 (12/5) Student presentations