

INVESTIGATION OF ETHICAL PRACTICES IN RESEARCH AT POST-GRADUATE LEVEL

Dr. Muhamma Iqbal

Assistant professor Divison of education University of Education Lahore

drmiqbal@ue.edu.pk

Dr Shamim Ullah

Assistant Professor Institute of Education & Research University of the Punjab

Dr. Rizwan Ahmad

Assistant professor University of Education Lahore

Maria Shahid

M.Phil Education ELPS University of education Lahore

ABSTRACT

The study was aimed to explore the research ethical issues practiced by post-graduate students in Lahore universities. The M.Phil and P.hD students of public and private universities of Lahore were considered the population of this study. 300 students were selected randomly from 6 public and private universities including 150 from public and 150 from private universities. The questionnaire was constructed on the base of ethical framework of APA 6th edition having five main aspects of ethical research (i) respect for person, (ii) beneficence, (iii) justice, (iv) confidentiality and (v) plagiarism. Survey design was used for data collection. Before data collecting, formal permission was taken. Data analysis involved statistical computations for means, percentages, independent t-test. It was found that overall participants have practice about research ethics. However the students of public universities have practice more research ethics as compared to private universities students practices and public universities students followed more strictly APA research ethical practices as compared to the private universities students. It was recommended that private universities students should be trained to use ethical practices. Both agreed that these five major ethical aspects of research were much valid for ethically safe research.

Key Words: *Ethical practices, Post-Graduates, Public Universities, Private Universities, APA Manual.*

INTRODUCTION

Ethical considerations are integral to research practices. Discussions of research ethics in social science have expanded with the growing influence of social research in recent decades. Ethics applies not just to qualitative research involving humans, but also to quantitative data collection and analysis. Ethics training is included in graduate curriculums, preparing students to ethically disseminate findings in theses and dissertations. Various approaches have been used to teach research ethics, including lectures, written assignments, group discussions, guest speakers, media, case studies, and peer presentations (Chapman, 2013; Rissanen & Lofstrom, 2014).

Research ethics issues gained prominence after World War II and the Nuremberg trials, when Nazi scientists experimented on humans without consent and were convicted of crimes against humanity. This highlighted the need for voluntary participation, avoiding harm, and benefiting research subjects. Principles established in the Nuremberg Code and Helsinki Declaration laid the foundation for research ethics standards worldwide, though violations still occurred. The principles articulated in the Belmont Report, which include respect for individuals, beneficence, and justice, have gained broad acceptance. In addition to these principles, there are supplementary standards that cover aspects such as social significance, scientific validity, equitable subject selection, a favorable balance between risks and benefits, independent evaluation, and informed consent. (Bell & Bryman, 2007).

Ongoing attention to research ethics is critical. Standards aim to ensure high quality, informed participation, confidentiality, voluntary involvement, risk minimization, transparency about funding and conflicts of interest. Comprehensive ethics education and review processes facilitate ethical research and uphold public trust.

Their prosperity plans and in 1964 the Nuremberg code worked the foundation of the Helsinki Statement which was embraced by the wellbeing board. No matter what the progression of overall rules in investigate, morals slight was still there in directing test requests. After WWII, most prevalent occurrences happened in the US. A longitudinal examination of syphilis had been done by dull individuals Likewise individuals got mixed up bearings in regards to the assessment in which they were partaking. This shame by and large impacted the US government's exhibition for not guaranteeing individuals as individuals in that frame of mind in 1972 and in like manner Public Commission perceived three key guidelines including regard for people, value, and equity for coordinating morals research. Belmont report contains all of the three principles and various establishments even at the overall level have embraced that to do investigate suitable way of behaving. By and large, this multitude of three guidelines capability as all out groups for driving investigation and these are furthermore becoming necessities for doing explore in foundations. Then again, the System for Exploration Morals Panel puts down six principles of moral examination.

- Morals research is of a great. Along these lines, assuming that an examination is ineffectually illustrated, other than the way, it very likely become a financial support from the ESRC that is deceptive.
- Research subjects and staff must taught totally about reason, methodologies, and proposed possible livelihoods of assessment, what backing includes, and what risks are incorporated.
- Members' anonymity should also be protected by data confidentiality.
- The commitment of exploration individuals should be purposeful.
- Risks of individuals must be kept away from on all events.

- 'The opportunity of examination ought to explain, and conflicts of connivance or bias should be clear (Ringer & Bryman, 2007).

Literature Review

Respect for Person

Fine and Sandstrom(1988) expressed that scientists should give dependable and significant explanation of exploration points, especially inside conditions where they have minute specialists, and that kids ought to be allowed authentic and honest to goodness opportunity to state as they would rather not take part (Fine & Sandstrom, 1988). Informed assent is one of three purposes of the standard of respect for people in sorting out and carrying out of examination plot. The morals standards dispersed by AERA (2000) clearly express of need that "individuals or their guards, in an investigation consider have honor to be taught about potential risks related with the assessment and of possible results for individuals, and to give their informed consent prior to checking out investigate" (section II.B.1). Informed assent is significant morals issue in coordinating investigation. As per Armiger, it is assumed that a man deliberately, willfully distinctly, and in a reasonable and show way, gives his assent (Armiger, 1997). Diener and Crandall have characterized informed assent as "the philosophy where individuals pick whether to participate in an assessment directly following being taught of real factors that would likely effect their decisions". This definition incorporates further four parts: Skill, voluntarism, perception, and endorsement. "Competence" implies that skilled individuals make the right decisions if they provide relevant information. 'Voluntarism' includes applying the rule of informed assent and as such ensuring that individuals uninhibitedly partake. 'Perception' alludes to the way that individuals totally know the possibility of the examination project, despite the fact that when procedures are befuddled (Diener& Crandall, 1978). It portrays some actual bother, any gamble to pride, and moreover the way in which subjects will be paid each thing cautiously (Copies and Woods, 2005). The researcher ought to also be of the opinion that people who struggle physically, socially, and emotionally may require extremely clear language to comprehend (Robinson K., 1992). The opportunity to pull out is significant, yet it can feature how troublesome things can be to make after areas of strength for among members and a few specialists (Portage and Reutter L, 1990).

BENEFICENCE-DO NOT HARM

The ethical principle of beneficence traces back to the Hippocratic oath - "do no harm" (Beauchamp & Childress, 2013). As Beauchamp and Childress (2013) note, beneficence obligates researchers to conduct meaningful studies that serve and advance constituents. However, predicting benefit is challenging, especially in subjective research. Carr (1994) argues that if findings show research was not as beneficial as anticipated, this raises ethical issues, particularly for medical practice. Ford and Reutter (1990) state that

beneficence aligns with research benefits, while non-maleficence relates to participation risks. Non-maleficence necessitates minimizing harm. When researchers become aware of potential injury or loss, these must be addressed. Burns and Grove (2005) note harm can be physical, emotional, social or financial. Determining acceptable risk versus benefit is variable, but sometimes risks outweigh potential benefits, requiring study modification. Unfortunately, some studies have caused actual or potential harm to participants.

In short, beneficence requires maximizing research benefits while non-maleficence focuses on minimizing risks and harms (Beauchamp & Childress, 2013; Carr, 1994; Ford & Reutter, 1990). Predicting outcomes is difficult, so continuously evaluating potential issues is critical (Burns & Grove, 2005). If risks come to outweigh possible benefits, researchers are ethically obligated to revise or halt studies to protect participants.

JUSTICE-DECEPTION

Equity is inside the unit and the most basic component in morals any place overseeing human and animals be done. The guideline of equity alludes to comparing offer and poise. One of the fundamental and obvious features of this rule is avoiding abuse and mauling of individuals. The comprehension and utilization of the equity standard in experts' minds is shown by the view of individuals' defiance and their obligation to their review (News in short, 1999). The educational researcher does not engage in dishonest practices. As per rules of the American Instructive Exploration Relationship in 2007 purposes of trickiness are:

- Except if they have confirmed that, their use implies near minor danger to look at members; that studies that are close to logical, insightful, educational, and applied esteem support the use.
- Assuming that they have acquired the underwriting of institutional survey sheets one more genuine body with twisted on the morals of exploration. Experts never mislead explore people about critical advantages of the assessment that would influence their ability to take an interest, for instance, actual risks, bother, or unpalatable energetic encounters.
- Right now that double dealing is a principal portion of the arrangement and lead of examination, informational researchers try to address any perplexity that investigation individuals might have no later than toward the completion of the assessment.

On amazing events, instructive examination might be expected to cover their characters to endeavor to investigate what couldn't be practicably finished. Under such circumstances, getting ready agents embrace the watch simply if it consolidates near unimportant peril for the investigation individuals and if members have spurred help to continue in this way from

institutional evaluation board. Although the fact that, without such sheets from one more conclusive body with ability on the morals of examination. Under such settings, mystery must kept up (AERA, 2000).

CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is a way of ensuring the member's right to protection by guaranteeing privacy. This means that in spite of the facts that researchers know who provided the data or can distinguish participants from the given data, members will not independently reveal the association. Boundaries surrounding common mysteries will be preserved (Lewis & Lawrence, 2005). In his Privacy Record and Privilege of Privacy, Kimmel (1988) observed that a general finding arising from exact writing is that various potential respondents will decline to participate in acceptable themes when categorizing Confirmation is weak, unclear, and not understood, thought to be likely to break. He believes that the value of information in sensitive research areas can be genuinely affected by the failure to reliably guarantee researcher confidentiality.

Privacy:

Diener and Crandall (1978) have examined privacy through three distinct lenses, encompassing the consequences of data provision, the observance or monitoring of regulations, and the dissemination of information. The influence of data provision primarily pertains to how a researcher collects individual data, including potentially deceptive information. It underscores the importance of ethical data collection practices, emphasizing the need for informed consent. Solely transferring individual data is both necessary and potentially harmful. In fact, "Religious inclinations, sexual practices, pay, racial biases, and other individual traits, for example, insight, genuineness, and fearlessness are more titely than title, rank, and sequential number (American Psychological Association, 1973).

Anonymity

While Frankfort and Nachmias say, "The commitment ensure anonymity of research members and to keep explore information classified is comprehensive. It ought to satisfy no matter what except if courses of action in actuality are made with the members ahead of time". The central methods for guaranteeing anonymity at that point, isn't utilizing the names of the members or some other individual methods for identification. Promote methods for accomplishing anonymity have been recorded as takes after: " research participants might be ask for to utilize from their own particular creation or to exchange very much recollected individual information (Louis & Lawrence, 2005).

PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism violations represent a form of deception that undermines academic integrity (Barnes, 2014). Cheating, on the other hand, is a deliberate act that encompasses a broader spectrum, involving the violation of rules for personal gain or advantage (Gross, 2011). According to Walker (2010), there is a dearth of robust data regarding the frequency of plagiarism and limited reliable information regarding whether plagiarism violations are intentional or a result of negligence. Multiple studies contend that there is a lack of dependable data concerning how often plagiarism occurs and its underlying motivations. Initially, researchers examined students' admissions of engaging in academic dishonesty and their rationales for doing so (Power, 2009).

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The study aimed to investigate the research ethical practices of post-graduate level students in public and private universities of Lahore

RESEARCH QUESTION

What are the research ethical practices of post-graduate level students in public and private universities of Lahore ?

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The researcher employed a survey design for this study, which involves quantitatively representing patterns, attitudes, or sentiments within a population by examining a sample from that population (Fowler, 2008). In this particular research, data were collected from both Public and Private Universities in the Lahore District. The target population consisted of students from these universities, specifically those enrolled in M.Phil (Education) and Ph.D. (Education) programs across six selected universities within the Lahore District. Three universities were chosen from each sector. The public universities selected for this study were LCWU (Lahore College for Women University), UE (University of Education), and PU (University of Punjab). In contrast, the private universities included UMT (University of Management and Technology), MUL (Minhaj University Lahore), and UL (University of Lahore). Students from these universities were randomly selected for participation. The total sample size for this study comprised 300 students, with 150 post graduate students from Public universities and 150 students from Private universities.

The research questionnaire was designed by using a five points Likert Scale. To collect the data, the researcher engaged with the students, explained the purpose of the study, and provided a comprehensive overview of the research work. Prior to administering the surveys, participants received verbal briefings about the questionnaire, ensuring that they were comfortable and able to seek clarification on any aspect of the questions if needed.

DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, a total of 300 questionnaires, accompanied by consent letters, were circulated among the postgraduate students from both private universities and public universities. Out of these, 252 questionnaires were collected, resulting in a response rate of 84%. Among the respondents, 121 out of 150 questionnaires were returned from the private

sector, representing a response rate of 80.66%. Meanwhile, 131 out of 150 questionnaires were returned from public universities, showing a reaction rate of 87.33%. The gender distribution among the participants showed that 200 were female, constituting 79.36% of the total respondents, while 52 were male, making up 20.6% of the total. The qualifications of

No	Statements	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rare	Not at all	Means
----	------------	--------	-------	-----------	------	------------	-------

the participants were categorized into three groups: "B.Ed(hons)," "M.Ed," and "M.Phil." Among the respondents, 107 held a B.Ed(hons) qualification, accounting for 42.5% of the total. Additionally, 119 respondents possessed an M.Ed qualification, representing 47.2% of the total, while the other 26 respondents held an M.Phil qualification, making up 10.3% percent of total participants. In terms of age, 183 were above 25 years old, constituting 27.4% of the total participants. Regarding academic programs, 199 respondents were enrolled in M.Phil programs, accounting for 79.0% of the total, while 53 respondents were pursuing Ph.D. degrees, making up 21.0% of the total participants having the 18-25 age group, comprising 72.6% of the total.

Descriptive Statistic Analysis Of “Respect For Person” Respondents Results Are Represented From Table 1.

			%	%	%	%	%	
1.	I always provide informed consent to participate in research.	Public	38.9	40.5	15.3	5.3	0.0	4.129
		Private	35.2	38.0	22.2	2.8	0.0	4.047
2.	I respect my participants and treat them fairly.	Public	64.1	28.2	3.8	3.1	0.8	4.519
		Private	44.4	40.7	10.2	1.9	2.8	4.222
3.	I know and obey relevant laws and institutional and governmental policies.	Public	50.4	36.6	6.9	6.1	0.0	4.313
		Private	33.3	38.9	16.7	9.3	0.9	3.953
4.	When I use children as subjects, I take proper permission from children guardians.	Public	49.6	28.2	16.0	4.6	0.8	4.223
		Private	42.6	28.7	14.8	8.3	4.6	3.972
5.	I give liberty to withdraw from research.	Public	36.6	32.8	18.3	9.2	3.1	3.908
		Private	27.8	36.1	25.0	7.4	3.7	3.768
6.	I use appropriate language in consents for the participants.	Public	53.4	37.4	8.4	0.0	0.0	4.453
		Private	46.3	32.4	13.9	4.6	2.8	4.148
7.	Voluntary consent of the human subject is essential.	Public	41.2	45.8	6.1	3.1	3.8	4.175
		Private	25.0	41.7	20.4	7.4	5.6	3.731
8.	I compromised on special people needs.	Public	42.7	30.5	18.3	6.1	2.3	4.053
		Private	30.6	38.0	22.2	2.8	6.5	3.833
9.	I assured members plainly comprehend the composed assent.	Public	43.5	41.2	12.2	0.8	1.5	4.253
		Private	29.6	44.4	14.8	10.2	0.9	3.916

Table 1

Frequencies and means of "Respect for person"

Descriptive Statistic Analysis Of "Beneficence" Respondents Results Are Represented From Table 2.

Table.2

Frequencies and means of "Beneficence"

No	Statements		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rare	Not at all	Means
			%	%	%	%	%	
1.	When conducting research on human subjects I minimize harms and risks, maximize benefits.	Public	44.3	33.6	15.3	4.6	2.3	4.129
		Private	38.0	34.3	14.8	5.6	6.5	3.925

2.	I respect human dignity in my research.	Public	55.7	38.2	3.8	2.3	0.0	4.473
		Private	50.0	28.7	13.9	4.6	0.9	4.245
3.	If there is, cause to believe that injury or death will occur I continue that experiment.	Public	46.6	22.1	6.9	4.6	19.8	3.709
		Private	29.6	37.0	16.7	7.4	9.3	3.703
4.	I disregard useless physical and mental suffering and damage.	Public	32.8	39.7	10.7	5.3	11.5	3.771
		Private	28.7	36.1	19.4	7.4	6.5	3.745
5.	I take special precautions with vulnerable population.	Public	42.7	38.2	14.5	2.3	2.3	4.167
		Private	25.9	38.9	27.8	2.8	3.7	3.813
6.	As a researcher, I am ready to end the experiments at any stage if experiment is likely to result in injury to the subject.	Public	33.6	35.9	20.6	6.9	3.1	3.900
		Private	26.9	31.5	21.3	13.9	6.5	3.583

Descriptive Statistic Analysis Of “Justice” Respondents Results Are Represented From Table 3.

Table 3.

Frequencies and means of “Justice”

No	Statements		Always %	Often %	Sometimes %	Rare %	Not at all %	Means
1.	Deception is use when it seems compulsory in research.	Public	57.3	26.7	7.6	5.3	3.1	4.297
		Private	38.0	26.9	25.0	4.6	5.6	3.870
2.	I keep documents confidential.	Public	55.7	29.0	11.5	2.3	1.5	4.351
		Private	39.8	31.5	17.6	5.6	5.6	3.944
3.	I manipulate data.	Public	31.3	39.7	12.2	9.2	7.6	3.778
		Private	23.1	39.8	18.5	12.0	5.6	3.635
4.	I am biased while interpretation of data.	Public	41.2	32.1	13.7	2.3	10.7	3.908
		Private	18.5	38.9	21.3	13.0	8.3	3.463
5.	I honestly report procedures.	Public	55.0	36.6	6.1	2.3	0.0	4.419
		Private	41.7	29.6	11.1	11.1	2.8	4.000

Descriptive Statistic Analysis Of “Confidentiality” Respondents Results Are Represented From Table 4.

Table.4.

Frequencies and means of “Confidentiality”

No	Statements		Always %	Often %	Sometime s %	Rare %	Not at all %	Means
1.	I never mentioned name of the participants.	Public	45.8	38.9	7.6	5.3	2.3	4.206
		Private	40.7	28.7	18.5	3.7	8.3	3.898
2.	In my records, I save information with member's fake names.	Public	42.7	35.9	12.2	7.6	1.5	4.106
		Private	34.3	35.2	21.3	5.6	3.7	3.907
3.	It is difficult for me to keep data under secret places.	Public	29.0	38.2	16.0	8.4	8.4	3.709
		Private	38.0	25.9	19.4	7.4	7.4	3.811
4.	I provide privacy to the participants.	Public	47.3	35.9	9.2	3.8	3.8	4.190
		Private	47.2	26.9	10.2	10.2	5.6	4.000
5.	I protect confidential communications such as paper or grants submitted for publications.	Public	48.9	29.8	16.0	1.5	3.8	4.183
		Private	38.0	35.2	13.0	8.3	3.7	3.971
6.	I assured safety about academic staff.	Public	50.4	29.8	12.2	1.5	6.1	4.167
		Private	40.7	30.6	14.8	6.5	7.4	3.907

Descriptive Statistic Analysis Of “Plagiarism” Respondents Results Are Represented From Table 5.

Table.5

Frequencies and means of “Plagiarism”

No	Statements		Always %	Often %	Sometime s %	Rare %	Not at all %	Means
1.	I am completely uninformed about literary stealing.	Public	42.7	32.1	13.0	0.8	11.5	3.938
		Private	32.4	37.0	15.7	6.5	8.3	3.787
2.	I honor patents, copyrights and other forms of intellectual property.	Public	46.6	29.8	17.6	5.3	0.8	4.160
		Private	33.3	28.7	25.0	9.3	3.7	3.787
3.	I utilize unpublished information.	Public	32.8	34.4	17.6	3.1	12.2	3.725
		Private	35.2	25.0	24.1	10.2	5.6	3.740
4.	I give credit where credit is due.	Public	48.9	28.2	17.6	3.1	2.3	4.183
		Private	34.3	33.3	21.3	6.5	4.6	3.861
5.	I avoid legitimate affirmation or acknowledgment for all supporters of research.	Public	36.6	34.4	16.8	6.1	6.1	3.893
		Private	32.4	33.3	23.1	6.5	4.6	3.824

Ho: There is no mean difference of ethical practices in public and private universities.

Independent t-test is conducted to compares means of *Ethical Practices of Research* and *Public and private universities*.

Table 6

	Institution	N	Mean	Std.Deviation
Ethical practices of research	Public	128	132.2500	13.04505
	Private	108	125.3611	20.05901

Table 1 displays the mean ethical practices scores for public and private universities. The public university sample had 128 respondents with a mean score of 132.25. The private university sample had 108 respondents and a lower mean score of 125.36. To compare the means from the two independent university groups, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The t-test evaluated whether the observed difference between the public and private university means was statistically significant. This analysis was appropriate because it can compare the mean scores from two independent groups (public and private universities) and determine if the difference is significant or likely due to chance.

Compare Means of Ethical practices, Public, and Private Universities.

Independent t-test is conducted to compares means of *Ethical Practices of Research* and *privates and Public universities*.

Table 2

Ethical Practice in Research	Mean dif	df	t-value	Sig (2-tailed)
Levene's test for equal variances	6.88889	234	3.172	.002
Levene's test for equal variances	6.88889	177.9	3.064	.003

The results in Table 2 demonstrated a statistically significant difference in mean ethical practices between public universities (M=132.2, SD=13.04) and private universities (M=125.36, SD=20.05); $t(177.9) = 3.064, p = .003$. Based on these results, we rejected the null hypothesis that there is no difference in ethical practices between public and private universities. Specifically, the mean ethical practices score was higher at public versus private universities, indicating better adherence to ethical practices at public institutions in this sample. The difference between the mean scores was statistically significant based on the t-test result.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

This study finds that students of both universities have good understanding of main research ethics, respect for person, beneficence, justice-deception, confidentially and plagiarism. Although students know the all ethics related to research but both institute have different practices. Overall public universities students having excellent practices in research findings as compared to the students of private universities.

- In the first ethic respect for person majority of people have high means

DISCUSSION

Raising awareness about plagiarism is not limited to the undergraduate level; it should extend to primary education to ensure that students understand the concept and its consequences. It's crucial to establish a comprehensive understanding of plagiarism, encompassing rules, regulations, and the associated penalties (Hauptman, 2002). Students should be educated on proper referencing and crediting of sources, including the guidance provided in the APA manual (Zikerl, 2010).

Addressing plagiarism concerns benefits students, fostering excitement in their ability to express their unique perspectives through writing. A teacher's role extends beyond imparting

knowledge; they also bear the responsibility of reporting instances of plagiarism to the appropriate authorities (Robillard, 2007). However, this endeavor comes with its challenges, as plagiarism can deceive both teachers and students alike, masking the underlying factors that drive such behavior. Moreover, teachers' authority is constrained, and punitive measures can be limited in their impact (Robillard, 2007).

The APA guidelines emphasize that submitting previously published work, even if authored by the same individual, constitutes "self-plagiarism" (Zikerl, 2010). This practice, aimed at bolstering one's academic record, diminishes credibility. While referencing previous literature in subsequent research is acceptable, verbatim copying of content without proper citation constitutes intellectual theft. Correct attribution is essential, and direct quotes should be enclosed within quotation marks and appropriately cited (Kinsey & Comerchero, 2011).

The APA underscores the importance of crediting sources accurately, particularly for shorter quotes or excerpts under 40 words (Kinsey & Comerchero, 2011). For lengthier quotations, permission and acknowledgment are essential. Precise citation practices are paramount; referencing information that has not been read or consulted is discouraged.

Within the context of ethical principles for psychologists, the code of conduct is clear: copying another person's work is prohibited (APA, 2010). Credit should be attributed only when it's due for genuine contributions. Psychologists must avoid duplicating information, even within their own body of work (APA, 2010).

Despite the guidelines and regulations set forth by the APA, instances of plagiarism persist. This is sometimes due to individuals choosing the easy way out, neglecting the potential for personal growth and achievement that comes from pursuing authentic work. Additionally, time constraints and academic pressures contribute to students resorting to plagiarism as a coping mechanism. An interesting perspective emerges when considering the definition of creativity; some argue that if nothing is truly original, then the concept of plagiarism loses its relevance (Hauptman, 2002). This philosophical viewpoint highlights the complexity surrounding plagiarism and underscores the need to address how students perceive the concept.

In conclusion, fostering awareness about plagiarism should start at the primary level and extend through higher education. It's imperative to not only communicate the rules but to also instill a sense of responsibility and understanding of the consequences. A holistic approach should encompass proper referencing, ethical considerations, and a deeper examination of the meaning of creativity. Encouraging originality and responsible academic conduct ultimately equips students with the tools to navigate the complex landscape of knowledge while respecting intellectual property.

RECOMMENDATION

It is essential to impart training and foster awareness about research ethics and plagiarism across the educational spectrum, encompassing private schools, colleges, and universities. Scholars within private universities must diligently adhere to all regulations and guidelines governing research ethics. Supervisors should provide students with adequate guidance and the necessary time during their research endeavors. It's crucial to elucidate the APA format

for students, detailing how to appropriately engage with referencing, citations, and crediting sources.

Teachers play a pivotal role in upholding research integrity. They should take decisive action when they encounter instances of copying, pasting, or duplicating material in students' work. To reinforce ethical research practices, both teachers and students should undergo training in research methodologies and ethics. This training equips them with the knowledge and tools needed to navigate the complexities of ethical research conduct effectively.

REFERENCES

- American Educational Research Association. (2000). *Ethical standards of the American Educational Research Association*. Retrieved June 14, 2008, from http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/About_AERA/Ethical_Standards/EthicalStandards.pdf
- American Psychological Association. (1973). *Ethical principles in the conduct of research with human subjects*. Ad Hoc Committee on Ethical Standards in Psychological Research: Washington, DC.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved July 9, 2018, from <http://www.apa.org/ethics/>
- Armiger B. (1997). Ethics in nursing research: Profile, principles, perspective. *Nursing Research*, 26 (5): 330-333.
- Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: An exploratory content analysis, *British Journal of Management* 18: 63 –77.
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/Images/Framework_for_Research_Ethics_tcm8-4586.pdf (accessed 16 July 2018).
- Beauchamp T. L. & Childres, J. F. (2001) *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 5th ed, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Burns N., Grove, S.K. (2005). *The practice of nursing research: Conduct, critique, and utilization* (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: Elsevier/Saunders.
- Carr. L. (1994). The strengths & weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research. What method for Nursing? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 20: 716-721
- Chapman LR, Hassan FH, Modayil M, Oommen E, Park T and Horner J (2013) Responsible conduct of research: For students, by students. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders* 40: 15–30.
- Diener, E. and Crandall, R. (1978). *Ethics in Social and Behavioral Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fine, G.A. & Sandstrom, K.L. (1988) *Knowing children: participant observation with minors. qualitative research methods series 15*, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Ford L., Reutter L. (1990). Ethical dilemmas associated with small samples. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 15, 187-191.

- Gross, E. (2011). Clashing values: contemporary views about cheating and plagiarism compared to traditional beliefs and practices. *Journal of Education*, 132(2), 435–440.
- Hauptman.R.(2002). *Dishonesty in the Academy*. 83(6). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40252440>
- Kinsey, B &,Comerchero, V. (2011). *Avoiding plagiarism & self- plagiarism*, 40. Retrieved from www.nasponline.org/publications/cq/40/4/writing-in-style.aspx.
- Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion& Keith Morrison, (2005) *Research methods in education*. New York, NY. Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s Press.
- Milgram, S. (1963). A Behavioral Study of Obedience.*Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67: 371– 8.
- News in brief. (1999). *Monash Bioethics Review*, 18(1), 3-8.
- Panel on Research Ethics (2014) The TCPS 2 Tutorial Course on Research Ethics (CORE). Available at: <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/> (accessed 8 June 2018).
- Power,L.(2009).Universitystudents’perceptionsofplagiarism.*The Journal of Higher Education*,80(6),643–662.
- Robinson K. (1992). Research module: R4 the real world of research: Part II = Research Ethics. *Nursing Times*, 88: 44.
- Robillard, A. E. (2007). *Wewon’t get fooled again: On the absence of angry responses to plagiarism in composition studies*, 70(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472248?origin=JSTOR-pdf>.
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41–59.
- Zirkel, P.A. (2010). *A study of self –plagiarism*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/12/06/zirkel>.



ISSN Online : 2709-4030
ISSN Print : 2709-4022

Vol.6 No.2 2022