STUDY SHEET, ETHICS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

PROCESS (CH 1) | VARIANTS, CONSENT (CH 1) | CONDITIONS FOR FREE INFORM. CONSENT (CH 1)
PRODUCT (CH 1) | SPECIAL INTERESTS (CH 1) | PROB. OF CORPORATE RESEARCH (CH 1)
SECRECY (CH 1) | OBJECTIVITY (CH 1) | EXXON VALDEZ (CH 1)
BIAS (CH 1) | HERBERT INHABER (CH 1) | DOD/NASA (CH 1, p. 11)
RACISM (CH 1) | CONSPIRACY OF CELLS (CH 1) | 2.4 MILLION DEATHS (CH 1, p. 1)
SEXISM (CH 1) | HOECHST (CH 1) | JACK WHITEHEAD (CH 1)
CONTRACT (CH 2) | TRUSTEESHIP (CH 2) | ABILITIES (CH 2)
MONOPOLIES (CH 2) | INVESTMENT (CH 2) | FIVE RULES (CH 2)
CONSENT (CH 2) | PRIVATE PROFITS (CH 2) | PROFESSIONAL CODES (CH 2)
ALGORITHM (CH 2) | TUSKEGEE SYPHILIS STUDY (CH 2) | AHERBERT INHABER (CH 1)
GNP (CH 2) | DISCOUNT RATE (CH 2) | DOD/NASA (CH 1, p. 11)
BARNEY CLARK (CH 2) | WHISTLEBLOWING (CH 2) | PROFESSIONAL CODES (CH 2)
UTILITARIAN (CH 3) | CONTRACTARian (CH 3) | ETHICAL OBJECTIVITY (CH 3)
EMPLOYERS (CH 3) | DEONTOLOGICAL (CH 3) | LAISSEZ-FAIRE CONTROL (CH 5)
CONSEQUENCES (CH 3) | THIRD PARTIES (CH 3) | INDUSTRIAL CANNIBALISM (CH 6, p. 103)
PROFESSION (CH 3) | ETHICS OF BELIEF (CH 3) | CYCLAMATES/SACCHARIN (CH 6, p. 102)
OBJECTIVITY (CH 3) | PARTICULAR DUTIES (CH 3) | ENVIRONMENTALISTS, DEVELOPERS (CH 7)
W.K. CLIFFORD (CH 3) | VEIL OF IGNORANCE (CH 3) | RIFF V. MORGAN PHARMACY (CH 4)
POLITICAL TEST (CH 3) | PRIMARY REASON (CH 4) | SECOND-STAGE ETHICAL ANALYSIS (CH 5)
CONTROL (CH 4) | VESTED INTERESTS (CH 4) | OBLIGATIONS, CONSEQUENCES (CH 5)
MONOPOLY (CH 4) | WHISTLEBLOWING (CH 4) | LAISSEZ-FAIRE CONTROL (CH 5)
PUBLIC GOOD (CH 4) | CONSUMER SOVEREIGNITY (CH 4) | ARGUMENTS, FREEDOM OF CHOICE (CH 5)
PATERNALISM (CH 4) | BROOKHAVEN REPORT (CH 4, p. 77) | THREE MILE ISLAND (CH 5)
FOUR REASONS (CH 4) | ASHWANDER V. TVA (CH 4, p. 75) | THE DEVIL AND DANIEL WEBSTER (CH 5)
PUBLIC NEEDS (CH 4) | RACHEL CARSON (CH 4, p. 68) | GENERAL PRINCIPLES, LIMITATIONS (CH 5)
END, MEANS (CH 5) | AAAS: TWO REASONS (CH 4, p. 73) | RESPONSE TO UNCERTAINTY (CH 6)
THIRD PARTIES (CH 5) | THREE QUESTIONS (CH 5) | REASONS TO MINIMIZE TYPE-II ERRORS (CH 6)
PUBLIC FUNDING (CH 5) | PUBLIC SCRUTINY (CH 5) | INCOMPENSABLE DAMAGES (CH 6)
PUBLIC BENEFIT (CH 5) | WITHHOLD, INTERPRET (CH 5) | INDUSTRIAL CANNIBALISM (CH 6, p. 103)
SHORT-TERM (CH 5) | RESEARCH TOPICS (CH 5) | CYCLAMATES/SACCHARIN (CH 6, p. 102)
JOHNS MANVILLE (CH 5) | KANGAS VS. NOSS (CH 5) | ENVIRONMENTALISTS, DEVELOPERS (CH 7)
40,000 DEATHS (CH 5) | FLORIDA PANTHER (CH 7) | PRESERVATION, PRECEDENCE (CH 7)
TYPE-I ERROR (CH 6) | LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (CH 6) | EPISTEMIC RATIONALITY (CH 7)
TYPE-II ERROR (CH 6) | FALSE POSITIVES (CH 6) | CONSERVATIVE COURSE (CH 7)
FALSE NEGATIVES (CH 6) | FIVE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES (CH 6) | WILSON: SPECIES PER DAY (CH 7, p. 119)
CONSUMER RISK (CH 6) | SELF-DETERMINATION (CH 6) | MAXIMIN, EXPECTED UTILITY (CH 7)
PRODUCER RISK (CH 6) | MERCURY CONTAMINATION (CH 6) | CONSTITUTIVE VALUES (CH 8)
MILL ON LIBERTY (CH 6) | APPLIED SCIENCE (CH 6) | CONTEXTUAL VALUES (CH 8)
THREE OPTIONS (CH 7) | FLORIDA PANTHER (CH 7) | RACIAL IDEOLOGIES (CH 8)
MEANS, END (CH 7) | AUTHENTIC COSTS (CH 7) | RESEARCH QUESTIONS (CH 8)
INTENTIONS (CH 7) | BURDEN OF PROOF (CH 7) | EVOLUTIONARY THEORY (CH 8)
HYPOTHESES (CH 7) | ETHICAL RATIONALITY (CH 7) | TECHNOCRATIC LEADERSHIP (CH 9)
ACTIONS (CH 7) | MORAL GOODNESS (CH 7) | PRACTICAL CHALLENGE (CH 9)
WASH 1400 (CH 7) | TACOMA NANOWS (CH 7) | ENGINEERING DESIGN RESEARCH (CH 9)
SIMBERLOFF (CH 7, p. 131) | STRONG/WEAK RIGHTS (CH 7) | COMPENSATORY PRINCIPLES (CH 9)
BIAS VALUES (CH 8) | VALUES, EXTERNAL (CH 8) | 1914: PRIMARY DUTY (CH 9, p. 154)
RESEARCH DATA (CH 8) | CULTURAL CONTEXT (CH 8) | PUBLIC-HEALTH PROTECTION (CH 10)
ETHOLOGY (CH 8) | SEXIST PREJUDICES (CH 8) | EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS (CH 10)
CAH (CH 8) | EVELYN KELLER (CH 8) | MORAL TRADEOFFS (CH 10)
THREE FACTORS (CH 9) | SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CH 9) | BURDENS OF PROOF (CH 10)
DESIGN (CH 9) | COMPANY LOYALTY (CH 9) | SOCIAL COSTS OF ERRORS (CH 10)
MODELING (CH 9) | PUBLIC DISCLOSURE (CH 9) | LIMITS OF ANIMAL STUDIES (CH 10)
IMPACT (CH 9) | SIMPLIFICATION (CH 9) |
ETHICS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, ESSAY QUESTIONS

FOR ALL CHAPTERS:

(1) EVALUATE THE MAIN THESIS OF EACH CHAPTER ACCORDING TO THE 5 LOGICAL CRITERIA OF ASSUMPTIONS, CONSISTENCY, COMPLETENESS, COHERENCE, CONSEQUENCES.

(2) EVALUATE THE MAIN THESIS OF EACH CHAPTER ACCORDING TO THE ETHICAL CRITERIA OF DEONTOLOGISM/CONTRACTARIANISM AND UTILITARIANISM.

CHAPTER 1:

(3) USE THE 5 LOGICAL CRITERIA TO EVALUATE WHETHER ATOMIC-WEAPONS TESTING SATISFFIES THE 4 NORMS FOR FREE, INFORMED CONSENT.

(4) WHAT ARE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS WITH THE INHABER STUDY?

(5) GIVE EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH BIAS THAT NEGATIVELY AFFECTS PUBLIC WELFARE, WOMEN, BLACKS, THE ENVIRONMENT.

(6) CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE SOCIAL-SCIENCE RESEARCH USED BY KEESLER IN HIS MEDIA ________

CHAPTER 2:

(7) WHAT IS THE CONTRACTUAL BASIS FOR RESEARCHERS’ DUTIES? WHY?

(8) CRITICIZE THE 5 RULES FOR AVOIDING ETHICALLY SUSPECT RESEARCH.

(9) EVALUATE PROFESSIONAL CODES AS A BASIS FOR ETHICS.

(10) WHY IS A DISCOUNT RATE SUCH A DANGER FOR A RESEARCHER TO USE?

CHAPTER 3:

(11) WHY ARE TWO STAGES OF ETHICAL ANALYSIS OFTEN REQUIRED? EXPLAIN AND EVALUATE.

(12) WHICH OF THE 3 CATEGORIES OF PRIMA-FACIE RESPONSIBILITIES IS MOST IMPORTANT? WHY?

(13) CRITICALLY EVALUATE WHETHER (A) THERE IS AN ETHICS OF BELIEF, (B) SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OUGHT TO BE SUBJECT TO A POLITICAL TEST.

(14) DISTINGUISH ETHICAL/EPISTEMIC OBJECTIVITY.

CHAPTER 4:

(15) WHY DO RESEARCHERS HAVE SOCIETAL DUTIES? EXPLAIN.

(16) IS PATERNALISM EVER JUSTIFIED IN RESEARCH ETHICS? EXPLAIN.

(17) IS WHISTLEBLOWING EVER JUSTIFIED IN RESEARCH ETHICS? EXPLAIN.

CHAPTER 5:

(18) DOES THE END EVER JUSTIFY THE MEANS? WHY OR WHY NOT?

(19) HOW FREE SHOULD UNIVERSITY RESEARCHERS BE TO FOLLOW THEIR OWN RESEARCH TOPICS? EXPLAIN.

CHAPTER 6:

(20) CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE CLAIM THAT SCIENTISTS ALWAYS OUGHT TO MINIMIZE (A) TYPE I, (B) TYPE-II, ERROR.
ETHICS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. ESSAY QUESTIONS

(21) STATE AND EVALUATE MILL’S VIEWS ON LIBERTY.

CHAPTER 7:

(22) CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE CLAIM THAT, IF ONE CONSIDERS ALL COSTS, DEVELOPMENT OFTEN IS UNECONOMICAL.

(23) CRITICALLY EVALUATE WHETHER DEVELOPERS/ENVIRONMENTALISTS MORE FREQUENTLY REPRESENT THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES THIS IS LIKELY TO BE THE CASE.

(24) EXPLAIN HOW EPISTEMIC RATIONALITY MIGHT Dictate DIFFERENT CHOICES FROM ETHICAL RATIONALITY IN THE CASE OF A BIOLOGIST INVESTIGATING HOW TO PROTECT AN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

(25) WHY MIGHT ONE USE MAXIMIN RATHER THAN EXPECTED UTILITY?

CHAPTER 8:

(26) CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE CLAIM THAT ONE ONLY OUGHT TO USE WELL EDUCATED, FINANCIALLY STABLE PERSONS AS RESEARCH SUBJECTS.

(27) CRITICALLY EVALUATE WHETHER EVOLUTIONARY THEORY OR ETHOLOGICAL THEORY HAS RESEARCH BIASES.

CHAPTER 9:

(28) CRITICALLY EVALUATE WHETHER ENGINEERS OUGHT TO REFUSE TO DESIGN SEXIST OR VIOLENT TOYS.

(29) CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE CLAIM THAT ENGINEERS ALWAYS OUGHT TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLE OF PLUS RESPICERE IN ALL SITUATIONS.

CHAPTER 10:

(30) UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES OUGHT SCIENTISTS TO ALLOW/CONDUCT PUBLIC-HEALTH RESEARCH ACCORDING TO METHODS/MODELS HAVING LOW SENSITIVITY?

(31) EVALUATE THE 4 PROBLEMS OF EPIDEMIOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND SUGGEST WAYS THAT SCIENTISTS AND ETHICISTS MIGHT OVERCOME THESE PROBLEMS.

(32) WHY DOES CRANOR USE AN ANALOGUE OF PASCAL’S WAGER?