



# Hypothesis: Student View Walkthrough

1. Students must sign up and install the Hypothesis extension. Then, they should accept your private Group invitation either through a link provided within your syllabus and LMS course pages.
2. After accepting the invite, students will click the direct link to the article's annotations

The screenshot shows the Hypothesis interface for 'Week 4: Article Annotation'. It includes an 'Overview' section with a brief description of the assignment. The 'Instructions' section contains a list of steps, with the first two steps highlighted by red boxes and numbered '1' and '2'. The 'Due' section indicates the deadline is 'End of Week 4'. The 'Assessment Guidelines and Rubric' section provides additional information about the assignment's value and resources.

**Week 4: Article Annotation**

**Overview:**

Learning to read and critique peer-reviewed research is a skill fundamental to being a healthcare professional. Use the browser extension Hypothesis to read an article, respond to the questions I have placed within Hypothesis, and offer your reactions and critiques of the ideas discussed and how they relate to you.

**Instructions**

1. [Accept the Hypothesis invitation link to join the PSYC 1010 Annotation Group.](#)
2. Click ["Thinking About Research: Theoretical Perspectives, Ethics and Scholarship"](#) to access the annotated article.

- Read the text carefully.
- Respond to the annotated questions.
- Contribute your own questions, reactions, and reflections.

**Due**

End of Week 4

**Assessment Guidelines and Rubric**

- If you need help using Hypothesis, see the [Quick Start Guide for Students](#).
- For tips on effective annotation, see [Annotation Tips for Students](#).
- To understand how your annotations will be graded, review the [Annotation Rubric](#).
- This assignment is worth 2.5 points out of a possible 10 Article Annotation points toward your final grade.

3. Following the external, direct link, a Hypothesis sidebar will appear. Only the single directly linked annotation will first be visible.
4. Students should then select the "Show All" option in the upper right of the Hypothesis sidebar. That button will also display the total number of annotations in that document. (In this case, nine.)

The emergence of research ethics came about at the end of the Second World War, when details of horrific medical experiments came to light during the Nuremberg trials. The Nuremberg Code (1947) was published two years later, followed by the Declaration of Helsinki (1964) and the World Medical Association(39) (which amended the declaration of Helsinki), which established ethical principles for research involving humans.

Social research has proceeded in two ways:

- deontological approaches to morality (Immanuel Kant 1724–1804)
- consequentialism (Jeremy Bentham 1748–1832).

Deontological approaches to ethics follow a set of principles that guide research. One such principle is that of 'informed consent', which was enshrined in the Nuremberg Code. Informed consent includes providing all relevant information about the study and what taking part will involve, including risks. The research subject must be able to comprehend the information and be competent to make a decision about involvement, and agreement to take part should be voluntary, free of coercion or influence. This also involves taking steps to ensure the participant is protected from any consequences of being in the study by ensuring that the research protects the identity of the participant. Deontological approaches reject the notion that what is morally right can be considered by assessing consequences.

Consequentialism is not concerned with whether an act is morally right, but with the consequences of the act. For research this translates to potential ethical dilemmas that the researcher may have to respond to and the consequences of their actions. Classic utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism. **Classic utilitarianism is consequentialist rather than deontologist because it denies that moral 'rightness' depends on anything except the consequences of an act.** The consequences, not the intention, of an action determine its merit. Critics of consequentialism have commented on the difficulty of anticipating all the potential outcomes that might result from an act. Important areas to be considered are:

- informed consent
- confidentiality
- anonymity.

Informed consent has two components: the research participants need to understand what taking part will involve; and agreement to take part needs to be voluntary. Generally, consent will be obtained by asking the research participant to confirm their consent by signing a consent form, by giving recorded verbal consent or by returning a questionnaire. Gaining consent may involve gaining approval from many more people than those directly involved in the study, that is, the host care organisation, in order to access patients. Consent needs to be voluntary, free from coercion, manipulation and any threat. There is also some evidence that response rates improve as interviewees are given more details about what the study involves (40) Gaining consent can provide an important part in negotiating the researcher's relationship with participants. This should involve participants being told about any risks of taking part and having the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

Consent to take part in research may be given on the basis that the information obtained about the participants will only be used by the researcher and only in particular ways. The information is offered to the researcher in confidence. Beauchamp and Childless(38) argue that the right to privacy rests on the principle of respect for autonomy. On this basis people have the right to decide who knows what about them. Research should uphold this principle. Confidentiality means protecting the identity of those who agree to take part in research, maintaining the data in a form such that the identity of the participant is protected. This implies keeping names and data separated by using a code that is only accessible to the researchers, and reporting data in a format that does not lead to individuals being readily identifiable. For example, it may involve removing or changing details to protect individuals who would otherwise be identifiable because of their unique characteristics or experiences.

Anonymity goes further than confidentiality, as the researchers do not collect named data at all. This means the researcher cannot identify which respondent gave the data (e.g. postal survey). This type of data allows participants to make any negative comments more freely without fears or concerns that anything they do report might be attributed to them with unknown consequences. For researchers, this might be difficult or impossible to achieve if the methods involve interviewing, and problematic if they wish to send reminders only to those who have not already agreed to participate. For a full discussion on ethics in research, see Israel and Hay(40) and Punch,(41) and for ethical dilemmas in qualitative research, see Welland and Pugsley (42).

5. After selecting “Show All,” the entire list of annotations will populate in the sidebar. Note, too, that they will correspond to highlighted portions of the text.

The emergence of research ethics came about at the end of the Second World War, when details of horrific medical experiments came to light during the Nuremberg trials. The Nuremberg Code (1947) was published two years later, followed by the Declaration of Helsinki (1964) and the World Medical Association(39) (which amended the declaration of Helsinki), which established ethical principles for research involving humans.

Social research has proceeded in two ways:

- deontological approaches to morality (Immanuel Kant 1724–1804)
- consequentialism (Jeremy Bentham 1748–1832).

Deontological approaches to ethics follow a set of principles that guide research. One such principle is that of 'informed consent', which was enshrined in the Nuremberg Code. Informed consent includes providing all relevant information about the study and what taking part will involve, including risks. The research subject must be able to comprehend the information and be competent to make a decision about involvement, and agreement to take part should be voluntary, free of coercion or influence. This also involves taking steps to ensure the participant is protected from any consequences of being in the study by ensuring that the research protects the identity of the participant. Deontological approaches reject the notion that what is morally right can be considered by assessing consequences.

Consequentialism is not concerned with whether an act is morally right, but with the consequences of the act. For research this translates to potential ethical dilemmas that the researcher may have to respond to and the consequences of their actions. **Classic utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism. Classic utilitarianism is consequentialist rather than deontologist because it denies that moral 'rightness' depends on anything except the consequences of an act.** The consequences, not the intention, of an action determine its merit. Critics of consequentialism have commented on the difficulty of anticipating all the potential outcomes that might result from an act. Important areas to be considered are:

- informed consent
- confidentiality
- anonymity.

Informed consent has two components: the research participants need to understand what taking part will involve; and agreement to take part needs to be voluntary. Generally, consent will be obtained by asking the research participant to confirm their consent by signing a consent form, by giving recorded verbal consent or by returning a questionnaire. Gaining consent may involve gaining approval from many more people than those directly involved in the study, that is, the host care organisation, in order to access patients. Consent needs to be voluntary, free from coercion, manipulation and any threat. There is also some evidence that response rates improve as interviewees are given more details about what the study involves (40) Gaining consent can provide an important part in negotiating the researcher's relationship with participants. This should involve participants being told about any risks of taking part and having the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

Consent to take part in research may be given on the basis that the information obtained about the participants will only be used by the researcher and only in particular ways. The information is offered to the researcher in confidence. Beauchamp and Childless(38) argue that the right to privacy rests on the principle of respect for autonomy. On this basis people have the right to decide who knows what about them. Research should uphold this principle. Confidentiality means protecting the identity of those who agree to take part in research, maintaining the data in a form such that the identity of the participant is protected. This implies keeping names and data separated by using a code that is only accessible to the researchers, and reporting data in a format that does not lead to individuals being readily identifiable. For example, it may involve removing or changing details to protect individuals who would otherwise be identifiable because of their unique characteristics or experiences.

Anonymity goes further than confidentiality, as the researchers do not collect named data at all. This means the researcher cannot identify which respondent gave the data (e.g. postal survey). This type of data allows participants to make any negative comments more freely without fears or concerns that anything they do report might be attributed to them with unknown consequences. For researchers, this might be difficult or impossible to achieve if the methods involve interviewing, and problematic if they wish to send reminders only to those who have not already agreed to participate. For a full discussion on ethics in research, see Israel and Hay(40) and Punch,(41) and for ethical dilemmas in qualitative research, see Welland and Pugsley (42).

- Students can then reply to previously embedded annotations (e.g., Instructor-supplied prompts or other student comments) or highlight the text and contribute their own annotations.

The screenshot shows a web browser with multiple tabs. The active tab is displaying a PDF document from Hypothes.is. The PDF text discusses ethical principles, including the Nuremberg Code (1947) and the Declaration of Helsinki (1964). It also mentions the World Medical Association (1949) and the Declaration of Helsinki (1964). The text discusses the importance of informed consent and confidentiality in research.

The Hypothes.is interface is visible on the right side of the browser. It shows a list of annotations for the document. One annotation is selected, and a reply box is open. The reply box contains the text "twicks" and has a "Post to PSYC 1010" button. The interface also shows a "Hide replies (1)" option and a "Cancel" button.