Ethics and Institutional Review Boards

The following is a list of resources compiled by UROP that relate to ethics and the teaching of research ethics in a variety of areas. While this is not an exhaustive list of resources available, these do give a variety of insight into how others have been successful preparing student researchers in ethics. They are available from the UROP library, GT Library, or on-line. UROP library materials can be checked out by coming to the UROP office. Please contact UROP for availability.

A number of these resources specifically address integrity in conducting research. For specific information regarding the Georgia Tech Honor Code and the Student Code of Conduct, please contact the Office of the Dean of Students and the Office of Student Integrity.

Georgia Tech’s Office of Research Compliance works to promote the ethical and responsible conduct of research and to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements relating to research involving human and vertebrate animal subjects, and rDNA.

The Office of Research Compliance (ORC) also offers a Responsible Conduct of Research Ethics Modules for Faculty to facilitate teaching research ethics to your students. These modules can be accessed online by Georgia Tech faculty, staff, and students. Module topics covered are: Research Misconduct, Data Management, Use of Animal Subjects, Use of Human Subjects, Conflicts of Interest and Commitment, Authorship, Publication and Peer Review, Collaboration and Mentoring.

Georgia Tech’s Institutional Review Board is supported by the Office of Research Compliance. On the ORC-Institutional Review Board website are a number of helpful links including policies/procedures, protocol submission, and informed consent.


Sensitive issues are an inherent part of some course content. The author has learned how to negotiate sensitive topics while developing a sense of community in a large human sexuality class.


The task of educating young scientists about research ethics may seem daunting, but consider the disservice done to them by tacitly fostering the belief that scientific research really is managed and executed as cleanly as we would like it to be. This article discusses ways that Washington and Lee University has tried to teach ethics.

Available From: UROP Office

This book (available in the GT Library and as an ebook) confronts the ethical dilemmas that psychologists may face throughout their career - both as practitioners and as researchers. The author tackles several pertinent areas that have especially arisen in recent history such as disclosure of HIV status, researchers trying to study child abuse while maintaining confidentiality, teachers or supervisors balancing their duty to students and their duty to the society in which the students will be credentialed--all find that formal codes of ethics and existing books do not and cannot address all their concerns and conflicts. Cases derived from issues faced by real psychologists are presented to illustrate difficult ethical problems, ethical errors, or laudatory ethical behavior. Kitchener lays a conceptual foundation for thinking well about ethical problems. She introduces a model of decision making based on five underlying principles and illustrates the ways in which it can help psychologists faced with tough choices make ethically defensible decisions. Beyond principled decision making in accordance with codes and her model, she considers the importance of ethical character and outlines the development of five key virtues that support moral behavior. Among the thorniest issues she treats in depth are informed consent, confidentiality, both sexual and nonsexual multiple role relationships, competence, and social justice. Throughout, she begins with principles and then shows how they are applied in clinical, educational, and scientific contexts. She illuminates her discussion with vivid case examples that reflect her own rich experience and understanding. This is a potentially very valuable resource for teaching and understand ethical issues that those in the psychology field may confront.


Most research in academic dishonesty focuses on why cheating is an epidemic in educational institutions, why students commit dishonest acts, and what can be done to curtail dishonesty in the classroom. Very little research focuses on what instructors have to endure when they charge students with academic dishonesty. This paper offers insights into actual cases of academic dishonesty, the process, the appeal, the result of each infraction, and why instructors might be reluctant to report incidents. Furthermore, this paper offers guidelines that can help prepare anyone who is serious about upholding academic integrity.


Best read one chapter at a time, each chapter is strongly focused on one topic specific to ethical decisions that arise in conducting research. Also, in order to stimulate further discussion of the subject, each chapter has case studies and questions to assign for further written or oral discussions at the end of each chapter. Chapter topics are very relevant especially to the sciences; however several may be applicable to engineering, the social sciences, and possibly the humanities. The first two chapters introduce the concept of scientific integrity with examples of poor decisions and a brief history on some scientific misconduct and the different philosophies of ethics. The third chapter reviews acceptable behavior of mentors. Other chapters thoroughly discuss authorship and peer review, use of humans and animals in biomedical experiments, genetic technology and scientific integrity, and record keeping. The chapters on managing competing interests, collaborative research, and ownership of data and intellectual property are relevant to fields beyond the sciences. Finally, this book includes two appendices that supply surveys and student exercises that can be used as an accompaniment to the chapter discussions. Overall, this is a very well-written and fascinating text on ethics and scientific integrity that is accessible to all researchers.

Available From: UROP Office
The causes of students’ academic dishonesty behavior were explored using survey and experimental vignette methods. Participants were surveyed about their own cheating behavior, neutralizing attitudes, performance/mastery orientation and perceptions of peer attitudes and behavior. As predicted, neutralizing attitudes influenced cheating behavior directly, but also indirectly, increasing the effect of individual attitudes. Observing others cheating was strongly correlated with one's own cheating behavior. These variables are also shown to have different effects on exam cheating and plagiarism and cases of giving and receiving unauthorized information. Correlations were tested using experimental vignette methods, which supported the claims made from survey data.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226858341_Situational_and_Personal_Causes_of_Student_Cheating

The risk of harm to students who serve as researchers or research assistants is an important consideration for faculty providing undergraduate research experiences. In the laboratory sciences, research environments may pose direct physical dangers, e.g., chemical hazards or dangerous devices/instruments. In contrast, the social-behavioral sciences typically present low physical risk to the researcher but require careful attention to risks that may harm human subjects. As inexperienced researchers, students may not know how to anticipate and/or avoid pitfalls that increase risk to themselves or their subjects. This article describes a research ethics training program implemented as part of a Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU) and provides some insights regarding risk assessment and protection for undergraduates in research.

http://www.cur.org/assets/1/7/Jun07Stiles.pdf

Very detailed presentation from a Georgia Tech professor about ethics issues that may arise.

Available From: UROP Office

Undergraduate students attending large research universities often have the opportunity to participate in the design, conduct, analysis, and dissemination of research initiated by faculty, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students. To date, guidelines for the conduct of this specific type of relationship – that of an academic researcher to an undergraduate research volunteer in a large team based research laboratory – remain absent from the peer-reviewed education literature. The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University recently called for further integration and depth of experience for undergraduates into the research process. Although not impossible, in order for large research universities to respond, it is necessary to act in a strategic and well-planned manner. Included are specific suggestions for success in facilitating this relationship within the context of a large, research-oriented university department.