

Princeton University
Mon. 9-12

Fall 2005
room TBA

Professor Elizabeth M. Armstrong
Wallace Hall 253
office hours: TBA, or by appointment
Mrs. Judie Miller, 207 Wallace, 258-5833

ema@princeton.edu
258-6981

Professor Harold T. Shapiro

Overview: This seminar is concerned with the professional obligations of social science researchers. A great deal of social science research is essentially collaborative and any collaboration raises a host of ethical issues since it involves taking others people's interests (e.g. human subjects, communities, fellow investigators, students, sponsors, etc.) into account. The topics covered in the course address the broad range of research relationships from those between student and advisor, to those between scientist and human subjects, data, peers, sponsors and the public, and to the relationship between research institutions and the government. In regards to each of these relationships we will discuss specific concerns of risks, benefits, fraud, misconduct, plagiarism, conflicts of interest and the morality of power. Our attention will focus primarily on current research practice, but we will draw upon past research practice and consider future practices as they relate to ethical concerns. The literature we draw upon will derive from professional organizations, as well as from the scholarly literature focused on the sociology or history of science.

Requirements:

The course meets on 6 mornings from 9am-12noon in Room [TBA] of Robertson Hall. Most sessions will include presentations by guests, students, and general discussion. To pass this course, students must fulfill the following requirements:

- Attend all sessions
- Participate in all classes
- Prepare and present case material to discuss for each class period (this requirement will not be necessary for the first class). Preparation for each case study includes: includes providing up to a five page summary of the case (with references for more background materials); circulating the summary 48 hours prior to class (delivered to the course blackboard website by Friday before 5pm); making a 15 minute presentation on the case and its relevance to the week's topic, and facilitating a 20 minute discussion among class participants.

Class 1 – Moral and Ethical Perspectives on Scientific Practice: Overview

The purpose of this week is to provide an overview of ethics, morality, and research practice. In addition, we will present material about one notorious case and discuss the various ethical dimensions of that case.

Assignment for the first day:

Read Required Readings noted below.

Readings (Required, Case, Further)
(ER=Electronic Reserves, SPIA-hardcopy Stokes library)

Required Readings

Arras, I. 'Moral Reasoning In a Medical Context' in "Ethical Issues in Modern Medicine" edited by Arras and Steinbeck. In the 5th edition the page numbers are pp1-40. (electronic reserves and on reserve in SPIA in Stokes Library)

Milgram, Stanley. 1963. Behavioral Study of Obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 67(4):371-378. (ER)

Class 2 – Scientists' Public Responsibilities, Organizational Constraints and Conflicts of Interest

This week we will discuss a scientist's public responsibility, organizational constraints, and conflicts of interest. We will begin with a discussion of a scientist's choice of research question, scientific progress, and bringing research to bear to improve humanity (responsibility to human subjects). This will be followed by a discussion of scientists' multiple institutional affiliations; the universities' role and responsibilities to scientists, the public (government), and students; the scientists' and universities' relationships to funders; private sector interests in scientific progress and the ownership of knowledge; and, the role of consulting in a scientist's work.

One angle our discussion will take is to consider where the onus of responsibility for ethical practice lies? Is it solely with the researcher, shared with the institution (by how much?), with the discipline and professional organizations? To what extent can each of these levels be monitored? Who is responsible for monitoring? What is the range of research integrity concerns that must be studied and monitored?

The readings for this week cover the following topics:

1. Conflict of Interest (What it is? Why does it occur? What are the consequences for knowledge, science?)
2. Ethical motivations, responsibilities for research
3. Relationship between science and the public

4. How science is influenced by politics

Required Readings

Science and Public Policy. 2000. Special Issue. Vol. 27 (3). (SPIA - Stokes Library: Q179.9.S32)

Carey, David. 2003. "Symbiotic Research: A Case for Ethical Scholarship." *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*. Summer: 99-114. (ER)

Cho, Mildred, Ryo Shohara, Drummond Rennie. 2000. What is Driving Policies on Faculty Conflict of Interest? Considerations for Policy Development. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcrri.html (ER)

Hilgartner, Stephen. 1990. "The Dominant View of Popularization: Conceptual Problems, Political Uses." *Social Studies of Science*. 20(3): 519-539. (ER)

Jacobsen, Karen and Loren B. Landau. 2003. "The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration." *Disasters*. 27(3):185-206. (ER)

Jones, Lisa and Karen Seashore Louis. 2000. The Commercialization of Academic Science: Conflict of Interest Policies and the Faculty Consultant. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcrri.html (ER)

Korenman, Stanley. 1993. Conflicts of Interest and Commercialization of Research. *Academic Medicine*. 68 (9): S18-S22. (ER)

Mumford, Michael. 2000. Organizational Influences on Scientific Integrity. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcrri.html (ER)

Pittenger, 2001. "Hypothesis Testing as a Moral Choice." *Ethics & Behavior*. 11(2): 151-162. (ER)

Richter, Elihu, Colin L. Soskolne, Joseph LaDou, and Tamar Berman. 2000. Whistleblowers in Environmental Science, Prevention of Suppression Bias, and the Need for a Code of Protection. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcrri.html (ER)

Sales, Bruce and Michael Lavin. Chapter 9: Identifying Conflicts of Interest and Resolving Ethical Dilemmas. In Bruce Sales and Susan Folkman (editors), *Ethics in Research With Human Participants*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. Pp. 109-128. (ER)

Sarewitz, Daniel. 1996. Chapters 7 and 8. *Frontiers of Illusion: Science, Technology, and the Politics of Progress*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Pp. 117-160. (ER)

Savelsberg, Joachim, Ryan King, Lara Cleveland. 2002. "Politicized Scholarship? Science on Crime and the State." *Social Problems*. 49(3):327-348. (ER)

Cases

Case 1: Defining a Research Agenda - Is there an ethical component?

International Health in the 21st Century: Trends and Challenges.

Special issue of *Social Science and Medicine* ([Volume 54, Issue 11, Pages 1615-1737 \(June 2002\)](#)) found on the Firestone Library website under e-journals to make your case.

Brown, Phyllida. 1993. "Has the AIDS Research Epidemic Spread Too Far?" *New Scientist*. May 15, 1993: 12-15. (ER)

Editors. 2002. "International Health in the 21st Century: Trends and Challenges." *Social Science and Medicine*. 54: 1615-1620. (ER)

King, Nicholas B. 2002. Security, Disease, Commerce: Ideologies of Postcolonial Global Health. *Social Studies of Science*. 32(5/6): 763-789 (ER)

Case 2: Eugenics – The Politics of a Science.

Ramsden E. 2002. Carving up Population Science: Eugenics, Demography and the Controversy Over the "Biological Law" of Population Growth. *Social Studies of Science* 32(5/6): 857-899. (ER)

Diane Paul. "Controlling Human Heredity 1865 to the Present" [pp 1-21]; (ER)

Arthur Caplan. "What's Morally Wrong with Eugenics?" in *Controlling Our Destinies* edited by P. Sloan. (ER)

Edwin Black. 2003. *War Against the Weak*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows. (skim it). (SPIA-Stokes)

Case 3: The Ethics of Audit Studies: Uncovering Discrimination – Deception versus Morality?

Massey, Douglas S. and Garvey Lundy. 2001. “Use of Black English and Racial Discrimination in Urban Housing Markets: New Methods and Findings.” [*Urban-Affairs-Review*](#) 36(4): 452-469. (ER)

South, Scott and Crowder, Kyle D. 1998. “Discrimination and Residential Mobility: Impacts for Blacks and Whites.” *Population Policy and Research* , 17(4): 369-387 (ER)

Science, Technology, & Human Values. 15 (1):5-64. (collection regarding audit study of journal review process). (ER)

Other examples of audit studies include employment studies. (please look into these studies and consider their ethical implications).

Class 3 – Responsibilities to Peers: Publication and Replication

Discussion of timely publication, plagiarism and veracity of research results, reporting of ethical practices, making data available for public use, documenting methods and replication. One topic of discussion will be the ethics of editorial choice of reviewers and discretion. Another topic will be when to reveal sponsorship of research and how to avoid conflicts of interest during peer review.

Required Readings

Anderson, Christopher. 1992. “Writer’s Cramp.” *Nature*. 355(9): 101. (*see if there is something more recent similar in a social science journal*). (ER)

Freedland, Kenneth and Robert M. Carney. 1992. Data Management and Accountability in Behavioral and Biomedical Research. *American Psychologist*. 46(5): 640-645. (ER)

Goodstein, David. [Scientific Misconduct](#): Outright Fraud is Rare; Unethical Behavior is Not. *Academe*. 88 (1): 28-31. (ER)

Hartley, J., E. Sotto, and J.W. Pennebaker. 2002. Style and Substance in Psychology: Are Influential Articles More Readable than Less Influential Ones? *Social Studies of Science*. 32(2):321-334. (ER)

Hedrick, Terry Elizabeth. 1985. Justifications for and Obstacles to Data Sharing. In Stephen Fienberg, Margaret E. Martin, and Miron L. Straf (editors), *Sharing Research Data*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. Pp. 123-147. (ER)

Mosimann, James E., John E. Dahlberg, Nancy M. Davidian, and John Krueger. 2000. Terminal Digits and the Examination of Questioned Data. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research*

Conference on Research Integrity. Available online at:
www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html (ER)

Sigmon, Sandra, Nina Boulard and Stacy Whitcomb-Smith. 2002. Reporting Ethical Practices in Journal Articles. *Ethics & Behavior* 12(3): 261-275. (ER)

Thomsom, Marshall, Christopher Aubin, Barbara Hall, and Matthew Knee. 2000. Erratum Citation and Accuracy in the Public Record. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at:
www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html (ER)

Cases

Case 1: Charlie West – Is it Plagiarism?

Case 2: Marty Brown & Jenny Ito – Research protocols and reporting: How much tweaking is allowed?

Case 3: Disentangling Sponsorship, Research and Training

Elliott, Carl. 2004. “Pharma Goes to the Laundry.” Hastings Center Report. September/October. <http://www.thehastingscenter.org/publications/hcr/hcr.asp>

Gladwell, Malcolm. 2004. “Who is Really to Blame for the Cost of Drugs?” *New Yorker*. Pp. 86-90.

Class 4 – Learning, Mentoring, Teaching, and Research Assistance Relationships

This week we will discuss a variety of mentoring, teaching and learning related ethical dilemmas. These will include ethical approaches to teaching, collaborative relationships, integrity in the learning process, responsibilities and rights of the research assistant, and the role of the mentor.

Assignment

Interview a member of the Princeton faculty or one of your academic mentors about their opinions or experiences with regards to the mentoring, training and collaborative aspects of the ethics of research practice. This might include a discussion about authorship, ownership of ideas, ownership of data, or rights, interests, responsibilities of senior/junior research scientist collaborations. Write-up your interview notes and provide an analysis based on the readings for this week and the preceding weeks. Circulate your interview notes and analysis via email to course participants. You may keep your respondent’s identity confidential.

Required Readings

Cahn, Steven. Chapters 1, 2, and 5. *Saints and Scamps: Ethics in Academia*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield. (ER – Ch. 1 and 5, SPIA-Ch.2))

Rosovsky, Henry and Inge-Lise Ameer. 1998. "Professional Conduct of College and University Teachers." In Bowen, William G. and Harold T. Shapiro. *Universities and Their Leadership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. Pp 119-156. (ER)

Shapin, Steven. "The Invisible Technician." *American Scientist*. 77 (6): 554-562. (ER)

Trow. 1998. "On Accountability of Higher Education in the United States." In Bowen, William G. and Harold T. Shapiro. *Universities and Their Leadership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. (ER) (currently circulating due back on 11/11/04)

Wajda-Johnston, Valerie A., Paul J. Handal, Peter A. Brawer, and Anthony N. Fabricatore. 2001. *Ethics & Behavior*. 11(3):287-305. (ER)

Wassyng Roworth, Wendy. 2002. [Professional Ethics, Day By Day](#): What Are The Ethical Obligations Of Faculty Members. *Academe*. 88(1): 24-27. (ER)

Class 5 – Codes of Ethics and Their Histories: Norms of Science and Scientific Practice

During this week we will cover the history of research ethics, the distinction between public policy ethical dilemmas and research ethics dilemmas, different ethical issues raised by study designs, debates about the relevance of ethical practice to social science and the norms of scientific practice, and finally we will discuss several different cases prepared and presented by students.

Required Reading

Belmont Report link:

<http://ohsr.od.nih.gov/guidelines/belmont.html> (ER)

Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects

<http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm> (ER)

Nuremburg Code

<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/references/nurcode.htm> (ER)

Office of Human Research Protection

<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp> (ER)

Office of Human Research Protection Policy Guides

<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/index.html>

Anderson, Melissa. 2000. What Would Get You in Trouble: Doctoral Students' Conceptions of Science and its Norms. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html (click on "students and mentors") (ER)

Arrigo, Jean Maria and Maj-Britt Juhl Poulsen. 2000. An Epistemic Model for Moral Hazards in Scientific Enterprises. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html (click on "theory and methods from other disciplines"). (ER)

Hardwig, John R. 1991. "The Role of Trust in Knowledge." *The Journal of Philosophy*. 88 (12): 693-708. (ER)

Hauptman, Robert. 2002. [Dishonesty in the Academy](#) . *Academe*. (Nov/Dec 2002). (ER)

Merton, RK. (1942) *The Normative Structure of Science*. in Storer, N.W. (1973) *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press. p267-278. (ER)

Mulkay, Michael J. 1976. "Norms and Ideology in Science." *Social Science Information*. Vol. 15 (4-5): 637-656. (ER)

Mitroff, Ian I. 1974. Norms and Counter-Norms in a Select Group of the Apollo Moon Scientists: A Case Study of the Ambivalence of Scientists. *American Sociological Review*. 39(4):579-595. (ER)

Nagel, Thomas. 1995. Moral Epistemology. In Ruth Ellen Bulger, Elizabeth Meyer Bobby, and Harvey V. Fineberg (editors), *Society's Choices: Social and Ethical Decision Making in Biomedicine*. Pp. 201-213. (ER)

Reybold, Earle L. 2000. Constructing a Personal Model of Research: Academic Culture and the Development of Professional Identity in the Professorate. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html (click on "students and mentors") (ER)

Shapin, Steven. 1995. Trust, Honesty, and the Authority of Science. In Ruth Ellen Bulger, Elizabeth Meyer Bobby, and Harvey V. Fineberg (editors), *Society's Choices: Social and Ethical Decision Making in Biomedicine*. Pp. 388-408. (ER (SPIA))

Cases

Case 1. Compare and Contrast Codes of Ethics Across the Professions. Trace the history of the development of these professional codes of ethics. Compare and contrast the historical trajectories (in terms of timing and substance). Using the schema developed in

the first week, how many of the cells in the table are covered by each discipline's code of ethics. How much of what is and is not present in the codes is a function of the disciplinary conceptions of appropriate evidence and methods? Would you agree with the omissions or inclusions in the codes? Substantiate your positions.

1. American Association of University Professors
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>

2. American Sociological Association
<http://www.asanet.org/members/ecoderev.html>

3. American Psychological Association
<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code.html>

4. American Anthropological Association
<http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm>

5. History
<http://www.historians.org/PUBS/Free/ProfessionalStandards.htm>

6. Political Science
<http://www.apsanet.org/pubs/ethics.cfm>

Case 2: Tuskegee – Use the references and links below as a starting point. Describe the Tuskegee research. Place the research in historical context. Provide a substantive timeline about how the Tuskegee study became and continues to be an important negative example of ethical research. Consider how issues of race complicate concerns about individual rights, interests, and obligations versus community rights, interests and obligations.

Final Report of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study Ad Hoc Advisory Panel:
<http://www.med.virginia.edu/hs-library/historical/apology/report.html> (On-site Annex, Fine (AnnexB) R853.H8 T874 1973a. (SPIA))

Freimuth, Vicki, et al. 2001. "African Americans' Views on Research and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study." *Social Science and Medicine*. 52: 797-808. (ER)

Jones, James H. 1993. *Bad Blood: The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment*. Toronto: Maxwell McMillan International. (Firestone 24-hour Reserve Room: R853.H8 J66 1993). (ER)

Reverby, Susan. 2000. *Tuskegee's Truths: Rethinking the Tuskegee Syphilis Study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina. (Firestone: R853.H8 T87 2000) (ER)

Case 3: Radiation Experiments

See: Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments – Executive Summary
<http://tis.eh.doe.gov/ohre/roadmap/achre/> (ER)

Class 6: Formalizing Ethical Research Practice and Extending Human Subjects Protection

Discussion of the various ways in which we have formalized ethical standards in research practice; i.e. through disciplinary codes of conduct and IRBs. How have they helped us and how could they be better?

Prior to the class meeting, take one of the online human subjects training courses.

University of Michigan

<http://www.research.umich.edu/training/peerrs.html>

NIH

<http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp>

UCLA

<http://training.arc.ucla.edu/>

Another comprehensive training site is at FHI (it takes 4 hours to do and not necessary for this class)

<http://www.fhi.org/en/topics/ethics/curriculum/default.htm>

What did you learn? What was essential that was missing? What was done well? What would you suggest as an improvement to the course?

Here is a webpage with more links to other training programs:

<http://www.nih.gov/sigs/bioethics/casestudies.html#research>

Required Readings

Cummings, Mary L. 2000. Waiving Informed Consent: Long-Term Consequences for the U.S. Military. In Steneck, Nicholas and Mary Sheetz (editors) *Investigating Research Integrity: Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Available online at: www.ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/rcr.html (click on “medical practice and clinical research”). (ER)

Lawson, Eleanor. 2001. Informational and Relational Meanings of Deception: Implications for Deception Methods in Research. *Ethics & Behavior*. 11(2):115-130. (ER)

Meer, Durriya and Leon VendeCreek. 2002. Cultural Considerations in Release of Information. *Ethics & Behavior*. 12(2):143-156. (ER)

Pittenger, David J. 2002. Deception in Research: Distinctions and Solutions From the Perspective of Utilitarianism. *Ethics & Behavior* 12(2): 117-142. (ER)

Shapiro, Harold T. 2002. "The Ethical Dimensions of Scientific Progress." The Eleventh Annual Howard A. Schneiderman Lecture. May 29 at the University of California at Irvine. Pp. 1-28. (ER)

Shapiro, Harold T. 2003. "Informal Experiments: The Ethical Issues." Keynote Address, Lasker Forum on Ethical Issues in Biomedical Research. American Association for the Advancement of Science. Washington, D.C., May 15. (ER)

Smythe, William E. and Maureen J. Murray. 2000. Owing the Story: Ethical Considerations in Narrative Research. *Ethics & Behavior*. 10 (4): 311-336. In addition, see the following: Gottlieb and Lasser comment on Smythe and Murray 11(2): 191-194; Smythe and Murray's Reply to Gottlieb and Lasser 11(2): 195-199. (ER)

Tisdale, Kit. 2004. "Being Vulnerable and Being Ethical With/in Research." In DeMarrais, Kathleen and Stephen D. Lapan (editors). *Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and the Social Sciences*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (ER)

Tunnell, Kenneth D. 1998. "Interviewing the Incarcerated: Personal Notes on Ethical and Methodological Issues." In deMarrais, Kathleen (editor) *Inside Stories: Qualitative Research Reflections*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Pp. 127-137. (ER)

Wolver, Laura R. 2002. Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing. *Political Science and Politics*. 34(4): 677-678. (ER)

Wong, L. Mun. 1998. The Ethics of Rapport: Institutional Safeguards, Resistance, and Betrayal. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 4(2):178-199. (ER)

Cases

Case 1. The Yanomamo Furor and Research in Developing Countries. – Describe Chagnon's research and methodologies, as well as Tierney's critique. Then visit the American Anthropological Association's website (<http://www.tamu.edu/anthropology/Neel.html>) and explore how the discipline responded. Summarize the debate. Outline all of the ethical dilemmas and take a position (with justification) on them.

Chagnon, Napoleon. 1974. *Studying the Yanomamo*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Firestone: GN345.C45) (SPIA)

Chagnon, Napoleon. 1997. *Yanomamo*. Harcourt Press (Firestone Reserve: F2520.1.Y3 C5 1997 (many copies)) (SPIA)

Tierney, Patrick. 2000. The Fierce Anthropologist. *The New Yorker*. October 9. Collection of news items, book reviews, and email correspondence. (ER)

Tierney, Patrick. 2000. *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon*. New York: Norton. (SPIA)

Case 2. *Fair Benefits for Research in Developing Countries* – www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/298/5601/2133 see also the detailed material referenced in the notes to this article. (ER)

Benatar, S.R. 2002. “Reflections and Recommendations on Research Ethics in Developing Countries.” *Social Science and Medicine* 54 (11): 1131-1141. (ER)

Pang, Tikki. 2002. “Commentary on ‘Reflections and Recommendations on Research Ethics in Developing Countries’ by S.R. Benatar.” *Social Science and Medicine* 54 (11): 1145-1146. (ER)

Benatar, Solomon R. 2002. “Response to Doctors Pang and Ashcroft.” *Social Science and Medicine* 54: 1147-1148. (ER)

Case 3: HIV and AIDS Research

Follow this link to the National Bioethics Advisory Committee’s 2001 Executive Summary on International Research:

<http://www.georgetown.edu/research/nrcbl/nbac/pubs.html> (ER)

Articles about AIDS research on the NIAID Division of AIDS website

<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/daids/vaccine/ethics.htm> (ER)

Bayer, Ronald. 1995. AIDS, Ethics, and Activism: Institutional Encounters in the Epidemic’s First Decade. In Ruth Ellen Bulger, Elizabeth Meyer Bobby, and Harvey V. Fineberg (editors), *Society’s Choices: Social and Ethical Decision Making in Biomedicine*. Pp. 458-476. (ER)

Nichter, Mark. 2001. Risk, Vulnerability, and Harm Reduction: Preventing STIs in Southeast Asia by Antibiotic Prophylaxis, a Misguided Practice. In Obermeyer, Carla Makhoulf (editor) *Cultural Perspectives on Reproductive Health*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Pp. 101-127. (ER)

Resnik, David B. 1998. The Ethics of HIV Research in Developing Nations. *Bioethics*. 12(4): 286-333. (ER)

Specter, Michael. 2003. The Vaccine. *The New Yorker*. (February 3): 54-65. (ER)