## Ethics in Experimental Research

Dr. Felicia Pratto

## Underlying Principles of Ethics

- With power and authority come responsibility
- •Researchers must guard against conflicts of interests— especially that our getting research is our own agenda, and may benefit us whereas ethics requires that participants' wellbeing (of particular types) comes first.
- Psychologists must follow ethics codes with respect to anyone they interact with: media, participants, other researchers, public.

### APA Ethics Code Principles

- Beneficence and nonmalfeasance
- Fidelity and responsibility
- Integrity
- Justice
- Respect for people's rights and dignity

## Beneficence and non-malfeasance

•Psychologists strive to benefit those with whom they work and take care to do no harm

## Beneficence and non-malfeasance

How can Experimenters/Researchers (Rs) do this?

## Fidelity and responsibility

- Establish trust in relationships
- Professional behavior
- •Seek to manage conflicts of interest that could lead to exploitation or harm.
- •Be concerned about the ethical compliance of their colleagues' scientific and professional conduct.

## Fidelity and responsibility

How can a researcher do this?With whom?

•What R behavior would violate this principle?

### Integrity re Research

- Tell the truth about results, procedures, measures.
- Speak up if other researchers are dishonest about results or other aspects of research.
- Deceiving participants must ethically justifiable to maximize benefits and minimize harm, and necessary.
- Must take responsibility to correct any resulting mistrust or other harmful effects that arise from the use of deception.

# Standards for Using Deception

- •Must be necessary in order to accomplish the research
- •Benefits of research must outweigh risks to the participants
- •Cannot deceive participants before consent – R cannot withhold information that changes the risk explained to P.

#### Justice

•All persons should have access to and benefit from the contributions of psychology.

#### **Justice**

- •In practice: If research could benefit particular kinds of people, they should be enabled to be participants.
- •Further, results should be shared with them.

# Respect for people's rights and dignity

- Individuals have a right to privacy, confidentiality, and self-determination
- •Some classes of people deserve special consideration in this regard.

# Respect for people's rights and dignity -- during studies

- •Respect for persons means respecting their behavior and feelings and beliefs.
- •In general, they should not be humiliated or scorned for how they act.

Respect for people's rights and dignity -- during studies

•If their actions in a study seem, after, to reflect badly on them, the R can help to frame them in a less dignity-threatening way.

Research

Ethical Practice

Feedback Loop

We should use research knowledge to inform our understanding of participant vulnerabilities and what (specifically) is ethical behavior for researchers.

#### Research

Ethical Practice

Feedback Loop

#### • Example:

- Social psychology generally knows that people have a need for positive regard, both in their own eyes and the eyes of others. They also have a need to belong.
- One *could* play upon these needs to psychologically coerce people to participate and remain in experiments.
- But people are supposed to be free to participate and to stop participation.

## Essential Issue

•The relation between a (potential or actual) participant and a researcher is a *power* relationship

How?

 In studies: The fundamental inequality of the relationship and greater knowledge the R has (in this situation) mean there is a high obligation for Rs to watch out for Ps wellbeing.

•In science generally: Experts have greater knowledge and ability to interpret information than others in general. They must use their greater capacity for others' benefit and never for their own over others'.

- Procedures to protect against self-interested ethical violations:
- •Ask a colleague who you trust to see if s/he thinks your procedure is ethical.
- •Let your Expter run you in the Expt and see how it seems from those eyes.

- •Procedures to protect against self-interested ethical violations:
- Independent IRBs.
- Declarations of conflict of interest and funding.

- •Milgram (1974) said obedience expt shows that people presume they cannot leave an expt.
- •This imposes on us the regular asking whether P wants to continue AND making exit easily available.

#### Potential Harms of Deception

- •One feels humiliated, gullible, uncertain, disrespected by being deceived.
- •If deception in research induces or reinforces mistrust in authorities/experts, that could lead to future harm.

#### Potential Harms of Deception

- Undermines public trust in science/scientists/practitioners
- Believing something false might lead to future harms (e.g., "you are smart" → not studying for exams)

## Debriefing Deception

- Aim: Show respect (probably by being honest)
- Reintroduce P's agency, apparent intelligence
- Reassure them of own competence, control

# Responsibilities due to Psychological Realism

- •We are interested in feelings and behaviors in exptl situations because they are psychologically real.
- We have to assume that knowing this is "just temporary" or "just an experiment/game" does not protect Ps.

#### Responsibilities due to Psychological Realism

- We have to take seriously that feelings and behaviors in exptl situations are real and consequential to Ps.
- •: If they are put in a worse position by being in a study, we have to restore them.

# The Importance of Debriefing

I highly recommend you find The Far Side © cartoon by Gary Larson, Andrews McMeel Publishers, about Edward Belcher. What a genius! I can't post it because it is his copyright.

#### Process Debriefing

- Derived from the feedback loop
- A procedure is what induced the *psychologically real* processes.
- •Debriefing should be an experiential process too, not just information.

#### Process Debriefing

- •Examples:
- •For false feedback on some test—instead of just explaining that the test was fake...

#### Process Debriefing

- •Examples:
- •For having confederate with whom participants interact pose as other participant or other genuine person...

# Procedure for Process Debriefing

- "Let's talk about what this experiment was about" (steps back to observer POV)
- •Review procedure in order but use more theoretical language. Connect some dots.

# Procedure for Process Debriefing

- Explain any between-subjects conditions (This makes what can be compared in design more apparent; P starts to formulate hypothesis).
- •Use non-personal language e.g., "some participants were randomly assigned to X condition and others were..."
- Apologize <u>now</u> that they were not told the whole truth about the experiment. Unamibiguously.

# Procedure for Engaged Debriefing

•E.g., say "By comparing X to Y, we can learn, and these things are hard to study without getting people's genuine reactions to situations."

## Procedure for Process Debriefing

- •Make fact you deceived them VERY plain and clear.
- Repeat 3 times as you verbally review study.
- •Possibly have P say it back to you. "How would you explain what I just said?"

# Procedure for Engaged Debriefing

- •Provide research reason for deception.
- •Why research Q is important and couldn't be answered otherwise.
- Apologize again for deceiving them.

# Procedure for Process Debriefing

- •Say you did a LOT of work in order to make this seem real.
- •Say that others also followed along with the experiment (implies you are not the only gullible person)

# Procedure for Process Debriefing

- •Ask not to tell other potential Ps so they have same experience and you don't contaminate your participant pool.
- •Don't ask them to lie, though.
- •Tell them what TO say (whatever is on your ad/info sheet etc).

## Ethics in a Nutshell

- •With power comes responsibility for own conduct and how one affects Ps and oversight over other Rs.
- Others come first.
- Treat people as if they have a right to autonomy and information.