

3

ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

At one time, it was possible to plan and carry out a small piece of research with the permission of a head of department, principal of a college, headteacher of a school or an administrator without having to go through formal channels. The informal route will still apply for many 100-hour studies as long as whoever is in charge is convinced of your integrity and of the worth of your research. However, times have changed. In most cases, your supervisor will be aware of any restrictions or legal requirements relating to your research and will ensure that you have appropriate advice about procedures well before you begin to plan your data collection. However, you may not always be able to rely on your supervisor's knowledge. For example, if you work in one organization but are supervised somewhere else, the supervisor may not know what your organization's requirements are. If you live in Singapore or Calcutta but are registered for a higher degree in an Australian or British university, your supervisor may have no idea at all about the local rules, so it will be up to you to find out what is required. Particularly if you have any doubts about the ethics of your proposal, make sure you consult as widely as you can, discuss your concerns and do not proceed if you or your advisers have any misgivings.

Research contracts, codes of practice, protocols and the principle of informed consent

There is nothing new about research contracts and ethical guidelines. They have all been used in a variety of ways for many years. They may have been called something different and their use was on a less formal basis than now, but they existed. Twenty years ago, Lutz, writing about ethnographic research, advised researchers that

> it is undoubtedly necessary for every ethnographer to establish some type of 'contract' with the society to be studied. Such a 'contract' may include specifications about what records may and may not be examined; where the ethnographer may or may not go, when, and under what circumstances; which meetings may be attended and which are closed; how long the researcher will stay in the field; who (if anyone) has access to field notes, and even who has the right to review and/or approve the ethnography and its analysis prior to publication, or under what circumstances they may or may not be published at all.
>
> (Lutz 1986: 114)

This is good advice, but it is 'advice', not a 'requirement'. These days, many organizations and professional bodies such as the Medical Research Council, the General Nursing Council, the British Sociological Association and others have gone a long way to formalize procedures and have produced their own ethical guidelines, research contracts, codes of practice and protocols, including such issues as deception concerning the purpose of investigations; encroachment on privacy; confidentiality; safety; care needed when research involves children – and much more.

Hart and Bond (1995: 198–201), writing about action research in health and social care, provide examples of different types of codes of practice or protocols which require researchers to ensure that participants are fully aware of the purpose of the research and understand their rights. Some are designed to be read out at the start of interviews, explaining that participation is voluntary, that participants are free to refuse to answer any questions and may

withdraw from the interview at any time. Most promise confidentiality and anonymity, but as will be seen later in this chapter, it may be more difficult to fulfil such promises than might at first have been thought. Some suggest that respondents should be asked to sign a copy of the protocol form before the interview begins, indicating that they understand and agree to all the conditions. However, Hart and Bond argue that in their view:

> It is not sufficient for the interviewer simply to read it [the protocol] out and then expect the respondent to sign . . . The respondent might justifiably feel anxious about signing anything, particularly at an early stage when the interviewer may be unknown to him or her. In our view it would be better to give the respondent time to read and re-read the protocol for himself or herself at his or her own pace, and to negotiate any additions or changes to it with the researcher. We would also recommend that the respondent should have a signed copy of the form as a record.
>
> (Hart and Bond 1995: 199)

This is sound advice. In my view, subjects should never be expected to sign any protocol form unless they have had time to read and consider the implications. All researchers will be aiming at the principle of 'informed consent', which requires careful preparation involving explanation and consultation before any data collecting begins (see Gray 2000, reported in Bell and Opie 2002: 144–6; Oliver 2003: 28–30).

Bowling (2002: 157) also makes what to me is an important and rarely considered point, namely that in addition to ensuring that participants know exactly what will be involved in the research, the informed consent procedure 'reduces the legal liability of the researcher'. In these litigious days, it is as well to be sure we have done everything, not only to ensure participants' rights but also our own position.

Blaxter et al. (2001) summarize the principles of research ethics as follows:

> Research ethics is about being clear about the nature of the agreement you have entered into with your research subjects

> or contacts. This is why contracts can be a useful device. Ethical research involves getting the informed consent of those you are going to interview, question, observe or take materials from. It involves reaching agreements about the uses of this data, and how its analysis will be reported and disseminated. And it is about keeping to such agreements when they have been reached.
>
> (p.158)

Ethics committees

Ethics committees play an important part in ensuring that no badly designed or harmful research is permitted. Darlington and Scott consider they have

> an important gatekeeping role in all research involving human subjects and are likely to be extra vigilant in their consideration of proposals for research concerning any potentially vulnerable groups of people. Ethics committees have a duty to consider all possible sources of harm and satisfy themselves that the researcher has thought through all the relevant issues prior to granting permission to proceed.
>
> (Darlington and Scott 2002: 22–3)

Their gatekeeping is not always welcomed. Reason and Bradbury report some of the experiences of one of the researchers in the action research Midwives' Action Research Group (MARG). She felt that

> the Ethics Committee not only seems to fulfil an ethical role but also a gate-keeping role in hindering would-be researchers whose work doesn't fit the empirical-analytic framework and also which might reveal unpleasant truths about the setting.
>
> (Reason and Bradbury 2001: 295)

The researcher actually felt that the committee members were trying to block her research, and asked 'What gives them the right

to tell me which women I can or cannot have a conversation with on a voluntary basis for my research? Do they have a legal right? Or is it assumed power?' Well, they certainly have a right to tell researchers what they can do and what they can't. I don't know whether they are legal rights but ethics committees are powerful and if your submission is rejected, you won't be allowed to do the research at all. Happily, I have never known or heard of reports of ethics committees trying to block research. It's possible that some committee members may sometimes appear to be . . . well, perhaps rather overzealous in their requirements – at least to researchers who have been required to resubmit, but they have a duty to ensure that no sloppy, damaging or illegal research is allowed to slip through and their requirements have to be met.

One complaint which is frequently levelled at ethics and research committees is the time taken to respond to submissions. Bowling (2002: 158) reports that researchers have been known to wait three to six months before receiving approval to proceed. Admittedly these delays have generally related to medical or other health-related topics where requirements are, and no doubt should be stringent, but few committees are speedy – at least, as far as anxious researchers are concerned. Sometimes, they meet infrequently. Dates of meetings are generally known beforehand but researchers will invariably have to submit applications well ahead of those dates. Everything takes time, so it's as well to be aware of dates, and of possible delays.

These requirements and delays may be alarming if you are working on a 100-hour project, but unless you are concerned with medical or health-related research, you may not always be required to go through the ethics committee procedures. However, you will still have to go through whatever vetting procedures your own organization, department and profession require, so make sure you know what they are.

Ethics and research committees often do their best to fast-track approval procedures for small studies but even so, they will never rubber stamp a badly prepared submission, nor should they, so do your best to get your submission right. It's unlikely your first draft will be good enough, so make sure your supervisor sees it, take advice, obtain any guidelines provided by the committees

and conform to their requirements. Of course, there may be no requirements to submit anything to a committee. It may be quite sufficient if your supervisor gives you approval to proceed, but if you do find you have to wait for approval, there is a lot you can do such as reading about and around your topic, making notes, trying out different types of indexing and cataloguing systems and thinking about ways in which your findings might become part of your literature review. You might spend time familiarizing yourself with your institution's computer system, recording references, and, all being well, considering the possible design of some of your proposed data-collecting instruments. What you can't do is begin to collect data and contact participants before written approval is received.

Confidentiality and anonymity

Not surprisingly, all the 'informed consent' statements and ethical guidelines I have seen mention confidentiality and anonymity. We all know what they mean, don't we? Well, do we? Is my 'confidentiality' likely to mean the same as yours? I regret to say that I have come across many broken promises of confidentiality and anonymity in research projects and imprecision about what is meant by both terms can result in serious misunderstandings between researchers and participants. So, if you say that participants will be anonymous, then under no circumstances can they be identified. If you promise confidentiality . . . well, decide what you mean by that *in the context of your investigation*.

Sapsford and Abbott (1996: 318–19), writing about unstructured interviewing, remind us that 'interviewing is intrusive, but having your personal details splashed in identifiable form across a research project is even more intrusive'. They make it clear that in their view '*confidentiality* is a promise that you will not be identified or presented in identifiable form, while *anonymity* is a promise that even the researcher will not be able to tell which responses came from which respondent' (p. 319). These definitions are sound and, with appropriate acknowledgement, could well be adopted in your own research. However, the implications of each can be significant. I raise some of the issues in 'Selecting

methods of data collection' in Part II of this book, but they are sufficiently important to raise also in this chapter. If you promise anonymity to questionnaire respondents, then, as Sapsford and Abbott point out, that means that no one, *including you* will know who has completed the questionnaire. As far as I am concerned, this means that no follow-up letters can be sent, no questionnaires can have coded numbers or symbols so that responses can be identified and no other sneaky tricks of any kind can be used. If you feel you have to have the option of sending follow-up letters, then you must qualify your definition to respondents by saying something on the lines of 'By "anonymity" in the context of this study, I mean that no one will see (your completed questionnaire/interview transcript) except me and all questionnaires and records will be shredded once the research is completed.' Is that what you mean? Think about it.

There can also be difficulties over confidentiality. If in your report you speak about the Director of Resources or the Head of English, you are immediately identifying the individuals concerned. If you invent a pseudonym or a code, it might still be easy for readers in the know to identify the individual or institution concerned. I recall the anger of one school principal who was guaranteed confidentiality for his school but the way the report was written made it clear to people in the area which school it was. No one minds being identified if the report is complimentary, but this particular principal was head of a school in a very poor area which for some years had had a reputation for truancy and indifferent examination results. Great strides had been made and many improvements achieved in the two years before the research but of course, long-term improvement takes time. His anger centred on the fact that he had been promised that the report would be written in such a way as to make it impossible for an individual school to be identified. His comment was that if any researcher came anywhere near his school in future, they would be shown the door. So, watch your language and don't promise anything you can't deliver.

Safeguarding confidentiality and anonymity if disseminating information by computer

In December 1997, the report of the Caldicott Committee on the review of patient-identifiable information was published (http://doh.gov.uk/ipu/confid/report/crep.htm). The review was commissioned because of concern about ways in which patient information was used in the National Health Service (NHS) in England and Wales and the use of information technology to disseminate information about patients. This is a very large, thorough and well-conducted review. Eighty-six flows of patient-identifiable information were mapped during the review and 16 recommendations for the improvement of practice were produced. It is easy to see how information stored on computers and transferred to other departments, hospitals or, for example, to general practitioner (GP) clinics might easily become available to individuals and organizations who have no right to that information. The same concern might also be expressed about the way firms, hospitals, universities and individuals disseminate information about employees, students and, in the case of research programmes, participants – unless steps are taken to ensure no individual can be identified. If you also have concerns about maintaining the confidentiality of your participants, I recommend that you read the report. I would also recommend that you consult the Data Protection Act 1998 (The Data Protection Registrar 1998), in particular the sections relating to individuals' right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data (http://www.open.gov.uk/dpr/dprhome.htm). A great deal of additional secondary legislation has already been tabled and no doubt more will appear as time goes on.

Ethical research in practice and the problems of 'inside' research



Regardless of the requirements of your institution and of your supervisor, this will still be your research. Even if you are not obliged to conform to required codes of practice nor to the demands of ethics or research committees, you will need to satisfy

yourself that you have done everything possible to ensure that your research is conducted in a way which complies with your own ethical principles. This is the approach adopted by Stephen Waters, a postgraduate diploma student and first-time researcher. At the time of the research, he was a teacher of English in a high school and decided that, if possible, he would undertake the research in his own school. He was interested in investigating the role of his own Head of English (called Director of English). The Director had expressed interest in and support for the study, and this convinced Stephen that the topic would be worthwhile and would have a good chance of being successfully completed in the time allowed (effectively three months). He decided to produce his own personal code of practice which made clear the conditions and guarantees within which he felt he must work, in order to ensure his own and his school's integrity. The preparation proceeded on the following lines:

1 Informal discussion with the headmaster to obtain agreement in principle.
2 Refinement of the topic, statement of the objectives of the study and preparation of a project outline.
3 Discussion with his tutor and further discussion with the Director of English.
4 Minor adjustments made to the project outline and a consideration of the methods to be used.
5 Formal submission of the project outline to the headmaster, together with names of colleagues he wished to interview and certain guarantees and conditions under which the research would be conducted.

The conditions and guarantees were presented as follows:

1 All participants will be offered the opportunity to remain anonymous.
2 All information will be treated with the strictest confidentiality.
3 Interviewees will have the opportunity to verify statements when the research is in draft form.
4 Participants will receive a copy of the final report.

5 The research is to be assessed by the university for examination purposes only, but should the question of publication arise at a later date, permission will be sought from the participants.
6 The research will attempt to explore educational management in practice. It is hoped the final report may be of benefit to the school and to those who take part.

So how did it go? This is what Stephen wrote after the project was completed.

> I felt that presenting the guarantees formally was essential. As I was completely inexperienced in research, I had to assure the headmaster that the fieldwork would be carried out with integrity and convince him that he could place his trust in me.
>
> With hindsight, I should have exercised greater caution. Condition 3 could not be met in full since I later found that, although a proper check could be made to verify statements participants had made while being interviewed, there was insufficient time for them to proofread a full draft. Condition 4 was fulfilled but the cost proved to be prohibitive and I decided to eliminate this condition when other case studies were undertaken. This experience certainly alerted me to the danger of promising too much too soon.
>
> It was only when the time drew near for the findings of my research to be disseminated that I became aware of the two areas where the wording of my conditions of research was open to interpretation. The first was that, in promising confidentiality (Condition 2), I had not made it clear what the implications of releasing information would be. As there was insufficient time to release a draft report, no one could check whether my interpretation of what they had said was fair. In any case, as the headmaster was the only person to hold a written copy of my guarantees, the respondents could only interpret the conditions under which they had agreed to participate from my verbal explanation. In retrospect, it would have been better to have provided a duplicated explanation of the written outline of my intentions. Teachers are busy people and it was unreasonable to assume that they would be

able to remember a conversation which had taken place some time before their services were formally required. As it was, whether or not they remembered the guarantees, they were totally dependent on my integrity to present their views in a balanced, objective manner.

More naïvely, until I was writing the report, I had not realized that identifying people by role may preserve the guarantee of anonymity for an outside reader, but it did not confer the same degree of obscurity for those within the school. Fortunately, my failure to clarify these points did not lead to problems – but it could have done.

Stephen Waters learnt a great deal from his first experience of conducting an investigation. He felt he had made some mistakes at his first attempt and was uneasy because he had not been able to fulfil all the conditions and guarantees. He had prepared the ground very well but had not fully appreciated the time and effort involved in reporting back to colleagues and in producing copies of reports. He was concerned at his lack of precision in defining exactly what he meant by anonymity and confidentiality, and made quite sure that in subsequent investigations he clarified the position. He found it harder to know what to do about role conflict. He was a full-time teacher and a part-time researcher – a not unusual combination – and on occasions found it difficult to reconcile the two roles. There were definite advantages in being an 'inside' researcher. For example, he had an intimate knowledge of the context of the research and of the micropolitics of the institution, travel was not a problem and subjects were easily reached. He knew how best to approach individuals and appreciated some of their difficulties. He found that colleagues welcomed the opportunity to air problems and to have their situation analysed by someone who understood the practical day-to-day realities of their task. On the other hand, he found interviewing some colleagues an uncomfortable experience for both parties. As an insider, he quickly came to realize that you have to live with your mistakes after completing the research. The close contact with the institution and colleagues made objectivity difficult to attain and, he felt, gaining confidential knowledge had the potential for affecting his relationship with colleagues. In the event, this did

not seem to be the case, but he could foresee situations where problems might have arisen.

When he had successfully completed the diploma course, he was asked whether he felt it had all been worthwhile and whether he had any comments that might be helpful to others who were undertaking a research project for the first time. He wrote as follows:

> I may have given the impression that my research was so fraught with difficulties that it was counter-productive. If so, it is because I wish to encourage the prospective inside-researcher to exercise caution and to be aware of possible pitfalls. In reality, I enjoyed my research immensely and found that the experience of interviewing a cross-section of teaching staff provided me with a much greater working knowledge of the school's management practices. Indeed, my research was so absorbing that at times I found myself struggling to keep pace with my teaching commitments. I am certain, even without hindsight, that I could have done little to resolve this dilemma. I can honestly say that my research has made me more understanding of the problems confronting those responsible for running the school and has subsequently provided a great deal of thought about the educational issues. If my research had not been practically relevant I would have felt concerned about the extent of my commitment to it. As it was, several recommendations which appeared in my first report have been taken up by the school; my third report on the role of the governing body in the curriculum was placed on the agenda of a governors' meeting in spring and many colleagues have been complimentary about the content of the case studies in general. If I had to choose one strategy that I would encourage prospective inside researchers to adopt, it would be to relate the research report to the pragmatic concerns of the institution. That might perhaps help to persuade colleagues that participation in research will be as beneficial to them as it is to the researcher.

Whether or not you relate your research to the pragmatic concerns of the institution depends on the nature of your task and

your own special concerns, but whether you are an inside or outside researcher, whether you are full-time or part-time, experienced or inexperienced, care has to be taken to make no promises that cannot be honoured. When Stephen carried out his first piece of research, guidelines, protocols and research contracts were less common than they are now. He had to devise his own guarantees and conditions. These days, most organizations will have their own set of rules, not only about the conduct of research, but also about who owns what.

Codes of ethical practice relating to intellectual ownership/property



At one time, relatively little was heard about intellectual property or ownership. It was and still is quite customary in scientific and technological departments for supervisors' names to appear on joint papers, the decision about the positioning of the names having been decided by the supervisor and/or in accordance with common departmental or institutional practice. Where research has been sponsored by government agencies or commercial organizations, institutions generally have an agreement in place about intellectual property rights about which students are, or should be, informed at the start of their research, particularly if they have been recruited specifically to carry out some pre-determined and pre-planned research. In some cases, students may be required to assign ownership of their intellectual property to institutions, to ensure that any potential patent or marketable findings are not lost, and so it is particularly important that everyone understands what this means. Is what students write the property of the institution or the organization or research council which funded it? Is it the property of the researcher alone, or the joint property of the researcher and the supervisor? If jointly owned, which name comes first in any published work? The question of the positioning of names may seem trivial, but the importance to all concerned cannot be underestimated. Universities in particular want their research students, and require their academic staff, to publish. Doing well in research assessment exercises brings not

only recognition and prestige but also money – and all three count.

In hospitals and other health-related organizations institutional property guidelines and rules have been in place for many years and recently I have begun to see advertisements for the post of 'intellectual property adviser' for individual and for groups of hospitals which seems to me not only to indicate the importance of this issue in today's research and publishing worlds but also its complexity. Even where codes and guidelines are issued, disputes about ownership are still known to rage where students who consider they have done all the work find that their supervisor's and professor's names appear before theirs on published reports of the research.

The various codes of practice, guidelines and policies which are now frequently provided in academic institutions, departments, hospitals and funding bodies should go some way to eliminating unethical practice and misunderstandings over ownership, just as I believe codes and protocols can help to eliminate similar unethical practice in issues relating to informed consent. No codes of ethical practice can resolve all problems but they do at least clarify some of the major issues in this difficult area – and that is a start.

If you are a first-time researcher, the idea of asking to see your institution or organization's guidelines relating to intellectual property rights may seem irrelevant. Even so, it might be interesting to find out what the guidelines say. You never know, your research may be sufficiently outstanding and of sufficient interest to be considered for publication and it's as well to know what your rights would be in that happy eventuality. It's always a good idea to be prepared for success.

The ethics and integrity in research checklist

1	It's your responsibility to discover whether any restrictions or legal requirements relate to your research.	If you or your advisers have any doubts about the integrity of your proposal, don't proceed.
2	Many organizations now have ethical guidelines, codes of practice and protocols.	Make sure you know if such guidelines exist and conform to their requirements.
3	Always aim for the informed consent of your participants.	Remember that respondents should not be expected to sign any protocol form unless they have had time to read and consider the implications.
4	If all proposed research has to be vetted by the ethics committee in your organization, make sure your submission is well thought out. Find out when the committees meet and allow time for your submission to be considered.	Consult, show your draft to your supervisor, talk to any students who have had their submission to the ethics committed rejected – or approved.
5	Confidentiality and anonymity are generally promised to participants.	However, make sure you know what you, *and* your participants mean by each.
6	You must never break any promises to participants, so watch your language and never promise anything you can't deliver.	So if you promise anonymity, you can't send out follow-up letters. No tricks!
7	If you are using a computer, take care who is to see, or might see your text, particularly if it gives the names of participants at any stage.	Consult the Data Protection Act, particularly sections relating to individuals' right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data.

8	Regardless of the requirements of your institution and of your supervisor, this will still be your research.	Even if you are not obliged to conform to required codes of practice, nor to the demands of ethics and research committees, ensure that your research is conducted in a way which conforms to your own ethical principles.
9	If you are carrying out research in your own institution or organization, do your best to let your colleagues know what you plan to do and how you hope they might be willing to help.	Don't be too ambitious. Consider how much time you are allowed in order to complete the research on time.
10	If you think you might wish to publish some of your findings at some stage, first make sure that you have obtained the permission of the people and institutions concerned.	And also make sure you have seen a copy of all your organization's and profession's codes of practice, protocols and guidelines, in particular ethical guidelines relating to informed consent and to intellectual property.
11	You may think you own what you have written and therefore, you can do as you like with any research report, article or book.	That might sometimes be possible, but not always, so check before you commit yourself.
12	No codes of ethical practice, protocols, guidelines and policies can solve all your problems, but they help.	They at least clarify some of the major issues.

Further reading



Aldridge, A. and Levine, K. (2001) *Surveying the Social World: Principles and Practice in Survey Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press. Pages 21–3 consider privacy, research ethics, informed consent, confidentiality and sensitivity.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. and Tight, M. (2001) *How to Research*, 2nd edn. Buckingham: Open University Press. Pages 157–61 deal with ethical issues in a clear and helpful way.

Brewer, J. D. (2000) *Ethnography*. Buckingham: Open University Press. Pages 88–99 discuss ethical issues relating to ethnographic research.

Busher, H. (2002) 'Ethics of research in education', Chapter 5 in M. Coleman and A.R.J. Briggs (eds) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

The Caldicott Committee (1997) Report on the review of patient-identifiable information. London: Department of Health.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) 'The ethics of educational and social research', Chapter 16 in *Research Methods in Education*, 4th edn. London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education*, 5th edn. Chapter 2, 'The ethics of educational and social research', provides 20+ pages of sound advice. London and New York: Routledge.

Darlington, Y. and Scott, D. (2002) *Qualitative Research in Practice: Stories from the Field*. Buckingham: Open University Press. See Chapter 13, 'Research ethics'.

Hart, E. and Bond, M. (1995) *Action Research for Health and Social Care: A Guide to Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press. Pages 198–201 provide examples of ethics protocols.

Laws, S. with Harper C. and Marcus, R. (2003) *Research for Development*. London: Sage. Chapter 13 deals with ethics codes and responsibilities towards respondents. Well worth consulting.

Lutz, F.W. (1986) 'Ethnography: the holistic approach to understanding schooling' in M. Hammersley *Controversies in Classroom Research*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press. This is a very thorough chapter which, in addition to discussing issues relating to ethnographic research, also gives good advice about establishing a 'contract' for research, bias, and the importance of protecting the identity of every participant which 'leaves the particular person and place unnamed, unharmed, and unchanged' (p. 115).

May, T. (2001) *Social Research Issues, Methods and Process*, 3rd edn. Buckingham: Open University Press. Pages 59–68 consider ethical issues in social research.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 11, pages 288–97 give excellent guidance about specific ethical issues, competence boundaries, informed consent, harm and risk, honesty and trust, privacy, confidentiality and anonymity, research integrity and quality, ownership of data, use and misuse of results, conflicts and dilemmas and trade-

offs. No matter how pressed for time you are, do your best to find time to consult this chapter.

Oliver, P. (2003) *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. Oliver clarifies research terminology, discusses the moral justification of research, areas of research which raise ethical issues, issues relating to the principle of informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality – and much more.

Polit, D.F. and Hungler, G.P. (1995) *Nursing Research: Principles and Methods*, 5th edn. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company. Pages 118–35 include sections on ethical dilemmas in conducting research, codes, the principle of beneficence (freedom from harm), the right to fair treatment, the right to privacy, informed consent, and vulnerable subjects.