International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy
and Allied Sciences (IJBPAS)

'A Bridge Between Laboratory and Reader'

www.ijbpas.com

AN EMPIRICAL SURVEY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF SOCIAL FORCES ON ETHICS IN UNIVERSITIES

SAMANEH SADAT SADIDPOUR[1], MARYAM SAFARA[2*], ZOHREH KHOSHNESHIN[3], VAHID MANSOURI[4]

1, 2: Women Research Center, Department of Psychology, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran.

3: Assistant professor, Department of Educational Technology, Faculty of Psychology and Education, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

4: Master of educational technology. Lecturer of Payam Nour University, Tehran, Iran

*Author for Correspondence: mail: Safara_maryam @yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Most of us are aware of the alarming statistics on ethical issues in universities. People encounter situations in which they have to decide to be ethical or not. Previous researches have suggested it is needed to be cautious on ethics in science but the question is how people decide to be ethical. Structure - agency is a key understanding mechanism in social science .Study carried out in quantitative and qualitative approaches. Population of the study will consisted of students in MA. Human science in State University in Tehran in 2011-2012. Sampling method is Purposive sampling (size of sample =110 students) who faced to unethical issues at least once. Describing data and analysis and answer to basic theory of the study, addition to using the descriptive statistics indices, hypothesis testing method and correlation coefficient used in the inferential statistics. Findings showed Participants focus on agent (1.6 ± 0.8) more than structure (1.5 ±0.6). Results showed 40% of participants believed agency and structure affects simultaneously. Results show significance relationship with context variables of people as gender. On making decision on agent or structure, the backgrounds of people are important, but people make decisions what to do in crisis ethical subject.

Key words: Academic, Ethics, Students.

INTRODUCTION

Deviant behavior threatens the future of science in the world [30],Despite this new awareness about ethical issues in scientific department, some scientists do not take ethical improprieties seriously because they regard misconduct as insignificant happens [7],Until the mid-twentieth century, serious deviant behaviors in science were rare, but later, science has faced to growing of academic aristocracy [36],Most of us are aware of the alarming statistics on article on ethical issues in universities [24], Scientists, laypeople, and politicians became aware of ethics in scientific research in the past decade. Previous researches have suggested it is needed to be cautious on ethics in science [7], [40], [31], [33], [29], [39], [38],People encounter situations in which they have to decide to be ethical or not. Reducing unethical behavior in academic settings [25],Concurrent with this, strong arguments made for why science is facing ethical issues increasingly [20], [13], [35],found faculty was more optimistic about declining unethical behaviors than were students. In their view, trusting in science is depending on ethical behavior of scientists and ethical approach in institution of science [36],Baarts [4],showed research ethics is no longer a matter of internalizing

professional codes of conduct. Rather, it is embedded in the totality of scholarly practice. Ethically aware practice depends to a considerable extent on the qualities and skills of the researcher. The skills needed are discernment, imagination, partiality and personal authenticity. Some social researchers have argued these approaches do not always translate well to social research; partly because the ethical dilemmas arise in social research are context-specific [15], [28], [34],Ethical dilemma is a situation in which a person can choose between at least two different actions [12],There are illustrations in sociology of cases in which researchers have identified findings with which the research funder or participating organization are unhappy [16], [19], [27],The focus of the current research is to answer if researchers are guilty for unethical conduct or situations force them to behave unethically. Structure - agency is a key understanding mechanism in social science . There is no 'escape' from structure-agency. This paper will start to deal with some definitions and summarize the position from both sides of the agency structure debate. Giddens defines action or agency as "the stream of or contemplated causal interventions of corporeal beings in the

ongoing process of events-in-the-world." It is analytical to agency a person or agent "could have acted otherwise." [14].

Each theory of action requires a theory of the elementary actor. The elementary actor is the wellspring of action, no matter how complex are the structures through which action takes place" [9],As Coleman's statement makes clear, any explanation of a social phenomenon without some reference to the mechanisms prompting human behavior at the individual is most likely incomplete [9], [17], [22],Those who are structuralism deny the human actor is the ultimate social reality, focusing instead on the situated human actor. Key concepts in this focus are emplacement and embodiment. A structure approach is often associated with the political left and theorists such as Smith and Marx. It argues because conditions change through time and space then the "great man" theory doesn't work. Structure and agency are dependent on each other, for existence; they also operate to a degree autonomous and independent of each other. So it is possible to trace the interaction of structure and agency through time, something difficult for structure theory cuts structure and agency into activity [3].

Moral perception is usually defined as which helps us determines what factors in a situation are morally significant, and how we can formulate action from what we see. Perception helps us to understand the morally relevant values in a situation [1],Therefore; in this article we ask what the most effective choice in a problematic situation is. Ethical behaviors of individual researchers are under unprecedented scrutiny [6], [11], [37], [5], [10],The question becomes not only a matter of whether it is ethical to conduct research, but also whether it is unethical not to engage in inquiry.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study carried out in quantitative and qualitative approaches. Population of the study will consisted of students in MA, studying Human science in State University in Tehran in 2011-2012. Sampling method is Purposive sampling. In this kind of sampling the researcher chooses the sample based on who they think would be proper for the study. Mainly, this is used when there are few people have know-how in the area being researched. The size of sample was 110 students (68 males and 42 females) who faced to unethical issues at least once. From this experience could be from all over of the world. The reasons

stated by the participant qualitative content analysis. Findings analyzed in two stages. First, collecting the answers by providing with an open question. Participants were given about the cause of the deviations and the qualitative responses provided to the agency or the separation of the two groups was found. Then the structure and functionality of the three options of low, medium and high. At this research, library and field method used to data collection. Library methods: articles and dissertations and scientific books used to gather information about subject. Questionnaires were distributed and data were collected for this study after preparing questionnaire and determine sample size with getting permits and verifying authorities in area of the district. The questions ask people to write their experience from unethical behavior and choose which of them are important: structure or individuals. Questionnaire used to get the desired information for the study. Questionnaire of this study is divided in two parts. The first part has done with quantities method and the second part has done with qualities method are the researcher made questionnaires. . In this research to reach reliability, Cranach's alpha coefficient estimation method was used the Cranach's alpha coefficient of questionnaire was

calculated 0.75 and 0.75 for productivity and Quality of work life questionnaires, respectively, by SPSS software. Describing data and analysis and answer to basic theory of the study, addition to using the descriptive statistics indices, hypothesis testing method and correlation coefficient used in the inferential statistics.

RESULTS

Findings show 32.7 percent of participant said agent is more important and 27.3 says structure is the root of unethical behavior, also 27.3 percent stated both of this parts are important. Participants focused on agent (1.6 ± 0.8) more than structure (1.5 ± 0.6). Married men were fonder of structure more than others.

Variables of age, sex, marital status, place of work, jobs, status, number of scientific papers - research, international travels, prize, books, tested by one sample Test to determine affective parts on tendency of participants to agent or structure.

ANOVA showed the mean comparison test to understand the impact of science agency in deviant behaviors. Sig was 023 (less than 0.05). They also published a scientific paper on the matter, it was important to know the structure. Sig was 040 (less than 0.05). Also checking the ANOVA test showed 68.4 percent of the factors in determining priorities. Agency or structure by set of variables we expected.

Chi-square test showed such study of gender in determining the impact of understanding of agency and structure. Asymp Sig. (2-sided) = 0.21. It also showed the Pearson coefficient of University Location was Asymp Sig. (2-sided) = 0.002 and for Papers published Asymp Sig. (2-sided) was 0.017 .In other words, Agency was priories.

Table No.1 Agent or structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agent	36	32.7	32.7	32.7
	Structure	30	27.3	27.3	60.0
	Both	44	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Table No.2.Crosstab
Count

		Agent or structure						Total	
		agent		structure		Both			
		frequency	percent	frequency	percent	frequency	percent	frequency	percent
gender	men	16	23.53	23	33.8	29	42.6	68	100
	women	20	47.6	7	16.6	15	35.7	42	100
		agent		structure		Both		Total	
		frequency	percent	frequency	percent	frequency	percent	frequency	percent
Taahol	married	8	38.1	8	38.1	5	23.8	21	100
	Not-married	25	33.78	21	28.4	28	37.8	74	100

Table No.3 One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
gender	29.695	109	.000	1.38182	1.2896	1.4740
Married or not	41.565	94	.000	1.77895	1.6940	1.8639

Table No4ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.637	26	.640	.820	.684[a]
	Residual	13.272	17	.781		
	Total	29.909	43			

b. Dependent Variable: agent/ structure

CONCLUSION

The aim of the study is to determine the priority of agency or structure for committing immoral acts in Science was formed. Priorities from the perspective of the participants in this study were college graduates were considered. Results showed 40% of participants believed agency and structure affects simultaneously, recognizing the impact of the two options, the agency and the agency participants as the most determining obliquity people show. Findings consented by Cole and Kiss [8],and studies showed Change is a process and not an event and educators will therefore have to be prepared to meet the challenges of this process. Educators must be prepared to act as agents of change and recognize they do have the power to understand the challenge and indeed the responsibility to act as agents of change [2],Results showed a married woman who works in Tehran and publishes least three scientific papers and so far did not travel to abroad are concerned with the structure more than other participants . Also Influence of gender is confirmed by Mulvaney [26], According to present research findings, the following suggestions are recommended On making decision on agent or structure, the backgrounds of people is important, but

people make decisions what to do in crisis ethical subject.

REFERENCES

1. Abowitz, K. (2007). Moral Perception through Aesthetics: Engaging Imaginations in Educational Ethics, Journal of Teacher Education, 58, 287-298.

2. Aincow (1997). Towards inclusive schooling. British Journal on special education. 24 (1:3-6).

3. Archer, M (1995). Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4. Baarts, Charlotte (2009). Stuck in the middle: research ethics caught between science and politics. Qualitative Research, September٤. 9, 4: pp. 423-439.

5. Bailey, P. A (2001). Academic misconduct: Responses from Deans and Nurse Educators. Journal of Nursing Education, 40 (3), 124-131.

6. Best, J.W. and Kahn J.V (2006). Research in education. United state of America: Pearson.

7. Bowie N (1994). A Kantian theory of Capitalism, presented at the 1994 Ruffin Lectures, The Dearden

School, University of Virginia, Charlotteville, Virginia

8. Cole, S. and Kiss, E (2000).What can we do about student cheating? About Campus 5, 5–12.

9. Coleman, J. S (1994). Foundation of social theory. Cambridge, Massachussetts: First Harvard University Press.

10. Davis, S (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. Teaching of Psychology, 19, 16-20.

11. 11.Field, M. J. & Behrman, R. E. (Eds.) (2004). Ethical conduct of clinical research involving children.Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences.

12. Fox, R M & DeMarco, J P (1990). Moral reasoning: A philosophic approach to applied ethics.Holt, Rinehart and Winston, United States of America.

13. Gaventa, J. & Cornwall,A (2001). Power and knowledge. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice (pp.70-80). London: Sage.

14. Giddens, A (1979). Central Problems in Social Theory. Berkeley: University of California.

15. Goodwin, D., Pope, C., Mort, M., Smith, and A (2003). Ethics and Ethnography: An Experiential Account, Qualitative Health Research, 13 no. (4) pp. 567–77.

16. Herdman, E (2000). Reflections on "Making Someone Angry, Qualitative Health Research. 10 no. (5) p.p. 671–702.

17. 17.Kincaid, H (1994). Reduction, explanation, and individualism. In M. Martin & L. C.

18. McIntyre (1998). Readings in the philosophy of science (pp. 497-513). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

19. Lawton, J (2001). Gaining and Maintaining Consent: Ethical Concerns Raised in a Study of Dying Patients, Qualitative Health Research. 11 no. (5) pp. 693–705.

20. Lincoln, Y. S., & Tierney, W. G (2004). Qualitative research and institutional review boards. Qualitative Inquiry, 10(2), 219-234.

21. Lingen Mark W (2006)." Tales of Academic Dishonesty and What Do We Do About It?" Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral

Radiology, 102, Issue 4, October:PP. 429–430.

22. Little, D (1998). Micro foundations, method, and causation: essays in the philosophy of the social sciences: Transaction Publishers.

23. Macrina, F.L (1995). Scientific Integrity: An Introductory Text with Cases. Washington DC: ASM Press.

24. McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. Ethics & Behavior, 11(3), 219-232.

25. McCabe Donald L., Kenneth D. Butterfield and Linda Klebe Treviño (2003).Faculty and Academic Integrity: The Influence of Current Honor Codes and Past Honor Code Experiences. Research in Higher Education. 44, No. 3, pp. 367-385

26. Mulvaney Matthew K. and Carolyn J. Mebert (2007). Parental Corporal Punishment Predicts Behavior Problems in Early Childhood. Journal of Family Psychology. 21, No. 3, 389–397

27. Punch, M. (1985). The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork. London: Sage.

28. Punch, M. (1998). Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research, in N. Denzin and Y.

29. Lincoln (1998). The Landscape of Qualitative Research, pp. 156–84. London: Sage

30. Lingen, M. W (2006). Tales of academic dishonesty and what do we do about it?, Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and End odontology 102, 429–430.

31. Richards HM and Schwartz LJ (2002). Ethics of qualitative research: are there special issues for health services research? Family Practice; 19: 135-139.

32. Rose, J (1998). Evaluating the contribution of structuration theory to the information systems discipline. Paper presented at the 6th European Conference on Information Systems, Granada.

33. Rowan, J (2000). Research ethics. International Journal of Psychotherapy, 5(2).

34. Small, R (2001). Codes are not enough: what philosophy can contribute to the ethics of educational research. Journal of

Philosophy of Education. 35 (3): 387-406.

35. Stern, E. B., & Havlicek, L (1986). Academic misconduct: Results of faculty and student surveys. Journal of Allied Health, 15(2), 129-42.

36. Sztompka, P (2007)." Trust in Science: Robert K. Merton's Inspirations". (2007). Journal of Classical Sociology, 7, 2: pp. 211-220.

37. Trimble, J. E., & Fisher, C. B. (2006). The handbook of ethical research with ethno cultural populations and communities. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

38. Williamson, G. & Prosser, S (2002). Action research: politics, ethics and participation. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 40(5): 587-593.

39. Williamson, E., Kent, J., Good enough, T. & Ashcroft R (2002). Social Science gets the ethics treatment. Sociological Research Online 7, 4.

40. Woodward, James, & David Goodstein (1996). Conduct, misconduct and the structure of science. American Scientist 84 (5): 479-490.