

[Subscribe](#)[Past Issues](#)[Translate](#)

Research Ethics Monthly | October 2018

[View this email in your browser](#)

The value of respect in human research ethics: a conceptual analysis and a practical guide

A Series on the Four Principles of the Australian National Statement on Ethics Conduct in Human Research

In this issues of the *Research Ethics Monthly*, Ian Pieper and Colin Thomson continue their series of short summaries of each of their four co-authored articles on the principles that underpin the Australian [National Statement](#), namely, research merit and integrity, justice, beneficence and respect.

The articles were originally published in the [Monash Bioethics Review](#) and remain available to subscription holders to that journal. The publisher, Springer, has generously agreed to place each of the four articles on Free Access for one month after the corresponding short summary is published in the *Research Ethics Monthly*. Last month they revisited their paper entitled *Beneficence as a Principle in Human Research*. This month they revisit the paper exploring the principle of respect for humans in the context of human research. The full paper can be found [here](#).

Respect for human beings is an essential component of human research ethics. It was emphasised in the Nuremberg code and has been continually recognised in all authoritative international and national guidelines since then.

Although primarily reflected in requirements for consent, the central concept is respect for personal autonomy, that is, for the capacity of individuals to be able to put their principles and values into practice. Sometimes the concept of dignity is added, recognising respect for a person's ability to live in accordance with their desires and values and requiring more than a focus merely on consent.

Individual autonomy has both a volitional component, requiring a decision to be voluntary and not made under compulsion, threats or coercion, and a cognitive component requiring a decisionmaker to have both the capacity and sufficient information to make a decision. It is important that all stakeholders involved in assessing consent in human research understand these foundational elements of ethically sound consent.

[Read more](#)

Are we missing the true picture? Stop calling a moneybox, a fishing hook

It can be pleasing to see mainstream media taking an interest in research integrity, particularly when misconduct involving you or your institution is not the focus of the story. Advising HDR candidates, new supervisors and other early career researchers about predatory publishers can feel like a public service and is something that can shock your audience into paying attention.

But could the label predatory publishers be concealing a more complex picture?

The binary notion of prey and predator; a trusting but naive researcher and a greedy con-

artist; and the white hats and black hats of old-fashioned westerns can feel authentic, real and dangerous.

[Read more](#)

Constructive Voices Online Panels

The NHMRC, ARC and Universities Australia have had a busy 2018. Among other things, there is a new [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) and the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research](#) has been revised.

AHRECS will be running two free *Constructive Voices* online panel discussions in November. The first will consider the new Australian Code (8th November) and the second the recent changes to the National Statement (22nd November).

Our observations of Australian institutions indicate it is easy either to do too much in response and end up with excessive bureaucratic requirements that make research harder, or do too little and risk institutional exposure to regulatory censure. The panels will last for 30 minutes and will include briefings from representatives of the NHMRC, and discussion of how institutions and researchers might best respond to the changes.

[Read more](#)

While you are here...

Did you enjoy this edition? Would you like to support the work we do? If so, please consider helping us cover the cost of matters such as hosting the Research Ethics Monthly and other web development by becoming an AHRECS Patron.

In addition to the warm glow from supporting our work, you will be subscribed for monthly updates of useful material (such as resources for use in your local workshops).

Subscriptions start at USD1/month and USD15/month gives you access to all materials.

A few profiled items from the subscribers' area:

(i) [A rose thorn by any other name?](#) - Discussion piece;

(ii) [How should respect be expressed in human research?](#) - Vignette;

(iii) [\(Australia\) National Statement, coercion and consent in clinical research](#) - Discussion piece;

(iv) [\(Australia\) Avoiding coercion and inducement in clinical research](#) - Vignette;

(v) [Illegitimate publishers \(cheeky graphic\)](#); and

(vi) [Looking for a predatory publishers image?](#).

To subscribe and for more information [click here](#).

Please join us in saying a big thank you to our new Gold Patrons:

- Bond University;
- Edith Cowan University; and
- Research funding body.

To subscribe and for more information [click here](#).

Things You May Have Missed...

Resource Library (<https://ahrecs.com/ahresources>)


1. [Retraction Watch: We're officially launching our database today. Here's what you need to know.](#)
2. [The "problem" of predatory publishing remains a relatively small one and should not be allowed to defame open access](#) - LSE Impact Blog
3. [Text recycling: acceptable or misconduct?](#) - Paper
4. [What does it mean to "take responsibility for" a paper?](#) - News
5. [Who Says You Need Permission to Study Yourself?](#) – NEO.LIFE

Blog (<https://ahrecs.com/blog>)

1. [Are you attending the 'Constructive voices' panel discussions in November about the 2018 changes to the Australian Code and National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research?](#)
2. [Undue Influence in Research Between High-Income and Lower-Income Countries](#)
3. [Justice in Human Research Ethics: A Conceptual and Practical Guide](#)
4. [It's not \(just\) about the money](#)
5. [How do we 'do' consent?](#)



Do you know someone who hasn't subscribed yet to the Research Ethics Monthly? Please encourage them to subscribe now and help us grow this community



Got an idea for a post or a suggestion for a guest?

Send an email to gary@ahrecs.com



Do you have a view, feedback or some constructive criticism on this or other posts? Every item has comment link so you can have your say and continue the conversation.



RESOURCE LIBRARY

Have you checked out the resource library recently? New items are added daily. There are separate sections for Human Research Ethics and Research Integrity. There are subsections for different categories of items e.g. 'In the news' and books.

We hate spam and definitely don't want to bother you with unwanted emails.
[Click here](#) to change your subscription settings.

This newsletter is authorized by the AHRECS team, [click here](#) for contact and other details.

We would never divulge your details to anyone else, including not disclosing you're a subscriber,
without your permission.

This email was sent to g.allen@griffith.edu.au

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS) · 14 Sovereign Way · Samford Valley, Qld 4520 · Australia

