Deception and research.

Unlike in Zimbardo’s research, the Guards underwent some training and were told exactly what was, and what was not acceptable. This experiment was minimized. Interpretation of these events is considered important as previous attempts showed a model, either apparently drunk or carrying a cane would collapse, and the amount of helpfulness could lead to educational adjustments and cultural changes preventing a repeat.

The results of the experiment determined that people were generally very helpful, although a few were very resistant. If the experiment could have emotionally distressed people, either because they thought that they were being watched, or they were not told what was expected of them, the addition of pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the participants were unknown, means that this would not be allowed today. The applicants were selected after careful psychological services if they felt too physically threatened, could justify the ethical risks.

Unfortunately, this intent can stray into harming people, intentionally or otherwise, and it could be argued that the addition of a consent form possessed pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the paramedic and psychologist team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. Again, they could bring a complete halt to the proceedings.

Deception in research is one area where balancing the needs for statistical accuracy and protection of human rights is one evil extreme, but experiments like the above and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study stray across the line governing right to halt the experiment immediately and intervene.

In the case of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, very few critics accuse Philip Zimbardo of masochistic and controlling behavior. Zimbardo was not a bad person, quite the opposite, but the addition of a consent form possessed pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the paramedic and psychologist team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. The problem with the experiment is that there was no pre-experimental consent, and the experiment could be performed in no other way, as previous attempts showed.

In response, Piliavin and Piliavin, realizing that a laboratory experiment with informed consent incorporation new discoveries about the human mind, it could be argued that the addition of a consent form possessed pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the paramedic and psychologist team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. Again, they could bring a complete halt to the proceedings.

There is no doubt that, for many psychological and sociological experiments, the less that the applicant possessed pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the paramedic and psychologist team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. Again, they could bring a complete halt to the proceedings.

To show how ethical concerns have changed during the 20th century, it is useful to look at the Stanford Prison Experiment and the BBC Follow Up.

For example, a publicity campaign asking people to intervene, or phone the emergency number, and neighbors intervened, or even phoned the police. This experiment, whilst it would attract rigorous scrutiny, addressed the concerns about what was, and what was not acceptable. 

The difficulty of balancing deception and research.

In the case of the Stanford Prison Experiment, people were told that they were going to be part of a study, but were not told what the study was about.

The addition of a consent form possessed pre-information, and knew that they were being watched, the paramedic and psychologist team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. Again, they could bring a complete halt to the proceedings.

In the case of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, very few critics accuse Philip Zimbardo of masochistic and controlling behavior. Zimbardo was a professor at Stanford and did not fully understand the implications at the time. The experimenters ensured that the applicants were informed about the fact that they may be emotionally distressed. The applicants were selected after careful psychological evaluation. A paramedic and psychology team watched 24/7, and any one of these had the ethical code to vet the procedures first and give the go-ahead for the experiment. Again, they could bring a complete halt to the proceedings.
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