|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer the following questions for each scenario:**  1. Is this a common occurrence? **Y**es or **N**o  2. Does it raise an ethical issue? **Y**es or **N**o  3. Is the activity described ethical or unethical? **E** or **U** | **Realistic? Y or N** | **Raises Ethical Issue? Y or N** | **Ethical? E or U** |
| 1. An automobile company study shows that older women are least likely to have an accident at night driving brand X. When Rosita, 55 years old, tries to buy a new car, the company’s dealer pushes brand X. |  |  |  |
| 2. An interdisciplinary faculty team has worked hard on developing a 10 million dollar proposal. The psychologist on the original team is unable to make the final meeting to decide whether to send the proposal off. The psychologist who goes to the meeting in her place is not up to speed on the project so he cannot say if it is ready for submission. Seven other participants (two engineers, a mathematician, an administrator, a biologist, and the substitute psychologist) collectively argue for or against sending off the proposal without the psychologist’s signature. |  |  |  |
| 3. A graduate student, Pedro Sevilla, has a better idea for a research topic. His idea is already has financial backing. He asks Professor Tenureless, a new professor anxious to document research success for promotion, to be his advisor. Even Pedro’s topic is outside Tenureless’s area of research, Tenureless decides to direct Sevilla’s thesis to add to his documents for tenure and promotion. |  |  |  |
| 4. A medical specialist, a clinical researcher affiliated with an academic institution, receives funds from the NIH to develop and test a new medicine, Cureall, for treating disease X. Her work shows that Cureall successfully treats X. Drug$ Inc. secures the patent for Cureall and generously compensates the medical specialist for her research. She neglects to inform the NIH of this. She has also been elected director of a professional academic organization based on her contribution to clinical research. |  |  |  |
| 5. A graduate student is about to defend her thesis. The principal instrument she used for collecting data, a survey form, was translated from an instrument used by another student which was approved by the IRB. It’s now a week before her defense and the representative from graduate studies accuses her of translating and using a research instrument designed by another student without due or proper attribution. |  |  |  |
| 6. Juan knows that most of his classmates will take Ritalin to help them focus on Professor Valdez’s important and difficult exam. On the way to the exam, his roommate offers him a dose. |  |  |  |
| 7. A research position has just opened up. The head investigator faces a difficult decision. Should she conduct an impartial, open, and fully publicized search to draw from a wide pool of qualified candidates or hire the post-doc currently working on the team? |  |  |  |
| 8. A student has been asked by his institution’s IRB to revise the form of a business questionnaire to conform to IRB requirements. He resubmits the questionnaire and waits several months for the IRB to respond. As the deadline for finishing his thesis approaches, the student contemplates sending out the questionnaire anyway. He figures that IRB approval is *pro forma*. |  |  |  |
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