

# Exercise: Two-statement icebreaker

*Kenneth D. Pimple, Ph.D.*

April 2011

**Introduction** I originally developed this exercise when I was invited to give a guest lecture in an undergraduate research seminar in psychology. It proved to be a quick and easy way to get the students involved and talking.

## The exercise

1. Ask students to write a short phrase to fill in the blank in these two statements:
  - a. In research in psychology, \_\_\_\_\_ is ethical.
  - b. In research in psychology, \_\_\_\_\_ is **un**ethical.
2. Ask them to mark one of the two phrases. Don't give any criteria for making the choice.
3. Ask each one to read her or his marked phrase without saying whether it was (a) or (b). Write the phrases on the board.
4. For each phrase, ask the students whether they think it is ethical or unethical. Optionally, allow them to answer "undecided" or "abstain." Tally the responses.
5. Discuss the results.

## Comments

When I first used this exercise, we noticed that the items which we generally agreed were ethical were also quite broad and vague, including "animal experimentation" and "brain research." I suggested that we could all imagine instances of brain research that we would find unethical, and no one disagreed.

We also noticed that many of the statements which we generally agreed were unethical posed real temptations to researchers.

The statement with the lowest degree of consensus ("experiment on children with their consent and the consent of their parent or guardian, but without a full explanation of the research"), disagreement turned on interpretations of the word "explanation." We all agreed that failing to explain some things (like potential risks) would make the research unethical, but failing to explain some other things (like the subtle implications of the working hypothesis) probably wouldn't.

---

Copyright © 2011, Kenneth D. Pimple, Ph.D. All rights reserved.

The first version of this exercise was published in *Trends* 4:4 (September 1997) and can be found at <http://poynter.indiana.edu/tre/trends/tre4-4.html>.

For information about this work, please contact Kenneth D. Pimple, Ph.D., Director of Teaching Research Ethics Programs, Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions, Indiana University, Bloomington IN 47405 3602; (812) 855-0261; FAX 855-3315; [pimple@indiana.edu](mailto:pimple@indiana.edu); <http://poynter.indiana.edu/>; <http://mypage.iu.edu/~pimple/>.

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce and distribute copies of this work for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost, and that the author, source, and copyright notice are included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights of reproduction granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act. Before making any distribution of this work, please ascertain whether you have the current version by contacting the author or checking <http://mypage.iu.edu/~pimple/>; look for "Exercise: Two-statement icebreaker."