Lecture 2: Ethical principles supporting research policies

(What is ethics? Arguments, harms, interests, choices, customs, science, law, and professional codes)

Our purpose here is to introduce some basic tools in ethics and four principles we use to make decisions.

INTRODUCTION

The study of ethics encompasses a wide range of activities. Some of the branches of this field of study include descriptive ethics, the empirical study of what people actually believe and value. It also includes meta-ethics, the theoretical study of abstract questions such as, Where does morality come from? and, How are moral judgments justified? (Are they justified by God’s will? evolutionary adaptation?)

In this course we will be primarily concerned with practical ethics, the branch of philosophy that analyzes arguments about good and bad, right and wrong. In practical ethics we ask normative, that is, value-laden, questions: What topic ought we to research? What should we do if we see someone cheating? What policies and regulations concerning research would be the best for our institutions to adopt?

What distinguishes ethics from other fields of study? Ethical questions typically arise when an action involves harm or potential harm to humans. Who is harmed by research misconduct? Consider the case of Jan Schon, a promising young physicist who won awards for his work in organic molecular crystals. In February 2002 he was named Outstanding Young Investigator by the Materials Research Society. By April of that same year he had been fired from his job at Bell Labs for falsifying data. Who did he harm? Himself, obviously. His employer. His friends and colleagues, who had believed in him. The Materials Research Society which had honored him. And, perhaps, the entire community of physicists, who were at a minimum embarrassed and chagrined by the publication of his misdeeds. Schon's misconduct was clearly ethical misconduct because he harmed others.

Can beings other than humans be harmed? Animals? Plants? Ecosystems? Artificial intelligences, such as really smart computer software or cyborgs? Our regulatory bodies have acknowledged that many (not all) vertebrates are sentient and can be the subjects of pains, and so our research regulations include protections for animals. Perhaps we should say, then, that ethical considerations typically arise whenever any action involves harm or potential harm to any sentient individual.
ETHICAL TOOLS

The central conceptual tools in this field are arguments, harms, interests, choices, virtues, conflicts, customs, science, law, and professional codes. Let us briefly define each in turn.

A. ARGUMENTS

Arguments are collections of premises followed by a conclusion. When we analyze arguments we have several jobs to do, and we do them by asking four questions:

1. What is the conclusion of the argument?
2. What are the empirical and normative premises? Are there any missing premises?
3. Do the premises justify the conclusion (validity)?
4. Are the premises true (soundness)?

Consider this argument:

"Most people from my ethnic background think that what I did is not plagiarism. Therefore, my case should not be reported to the Dean."

What is the conclusion? The key word, "therefore" signals us that the conclusion follows: Therefore, my case should not be reported to the Dean.

What are the premises leading to the conclusion? "Most people from my ethnic background think that what I did is not plagiarism."

Are there any missing premises? Yes, because the conclusion does not follow directly from the stated premises, so we must help the arguer by applying the principle of charity. Charity means to help out; here we help out by supplying the key missing link in the arguer's chain:

If most people from a certain ethnic background think that a particular action is not plagiarism, then it is not plagiarism and should not be reported to the Dean.

For practice in supplying missing premises, complete the exercise in Appendix 1.

We can now reconstruct the argument as follows:

1. Most people from my ethnic background think that what I did is not plagiarism.
2. If most people from a certain ethnic background think that a particular action is not plagiarism, then it is not plagiarism and should not be reported to the Dean.
3. Therefore, my case should not be reported to the Dean.

Do the premises justify the conclusion? That is, is the argument valid?

VALIDITY: An argument is valid if and only if the conclusion cannot be false if all the premises are true.

To assess validity, assume that the premises are true and then ask whether they entail the conclusion. In this case, if 1 and 2 are true, then 3 cannot be false. The argument is valid.

And now, in conclusion, we want to ask whether the premises are indeed true.

SOUNDNESS: An argument is sound if and only if the argument is valid and all the premises are true.

Let us grant that the first premise, 1, is true. Is the second? Assume that the arguer is correct, that most people from his ethnic background think that what he did is not plagiarism. Is it true that this fact makes it that case that what he did is not plagiarism? Obviously not, because plagiarism is defined by the educational community in which the arguer currently finds himself, not by the arguer's ethnic community. So, the second premise is false, and the argument is not sound.

Arguments are made of many different kinds of premises. Let us examine just two.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES

Empirical or factual claims are assertions that can be assessed by scientific means. Here are two examples:

“Most people from my ethnic background think that what I did is not plagiarism.”
“Human embryonic stem cells are totipotent”

To determine the truth of the first premise we would use sociological methods; to assess the second, biological methods.

NORMATIVE PREMISES

Normative premises, or value judgments, cannot be assessed by scientific means. They are assessed by rational means, finding out which premises we have the best reasons to believe. Here are two examples:

“If most people from a certain ethnic background think that a particular action is not plagiarism, then it is not plagiarism and should not be reported to the Dean.”

“We should not do research on human stem cells or clone human beings.”
Look back at the argument on plagiarism on p. 2. Can you identify the empirical premise?

B. INTERESTS

Ethical arguments concern matters in which we take an interest, such as whether we have acted improperly in writing a paper. Interests are desires or goals, objectives such as the goal of acquiring a graduate degree. Our interests may be desires nature has given us--such as the unconscious will to live--or goals we have consciously set for ourselves, such as the objective of becoming a professional physicist.

C. HARMS

Ethical issues arise whenever we contemplate harming or thwarting anyone's natural or self-determined interests. If someone in my university lab, call him George, is thinking about slandering me, or maliciously undercutting my research project, then George is facing an ethical issue. Even before he acts, his very plan is under a cloud of moral suspicion simply because he is thinking about interfering with my ability to pursue my interests.

Ethics not only involves harms; it involves choices, because George presumably has the autonomy, the free will, to decide to refrain from harming me. If George has been brought up in the right way, he will have been taught the difference between virtuous and vicious behavior. Learning that difference is part of customary upbringing of children in cultures around the world. When we are tempted to harm someone, we are caught in a conflict of interests: our interest in giving into temptation and doing what we know to be wrong, and our interest in resisting temptation to do what we know to be right.

Our certainty that some act is wrong, and our tendency to act wrongly, is reinforced by the rules adopted by the groups of which we are a part. Our family, or kin, is one such group; our profession another. Each group adopts rules as a way of solidifying the membership of each individual and maintaining its overall health and vitality.

We have seen, then, how ethics focuses on interests, harms, choices, and conflicts. It also considers our upbringings and the virtues and dispositions most of us have, gratefully, acquired at the hands of our parents, teachers, communities, religions, and professional associations.

Let us now work toward a more nuanced understanding of ethics in general and, in particular, the differences between it and customs, science, and law.

CLEARLY HARMFUL ACTS: RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Ethics is not easy to define, but an efficient way to work toward an acceptable definition is to begin with some cases of human behavior that we clearly recognize as unethical. Many ethical rules are determined by the roles we play: mother, teacher, friend, researcher, student. The duties of a student involve behaving oneself properly when taking exams, recording data, and writing papers. The duties of a professor involve many of the same duties of the student, plus
others, such as aggressive consideration of alternative points of view; scrupulous attention in attributing remarks and references; and conscientious observance of intellectual property laws.

Let us proceed by reading about a case of misconduct from your discipline. Click on the field closest to yours below:

**Anthropology:** Reiner Protsch  
**Biochemistry:** Robert Liburdy  
**Civil engineering:** John Sheils  
**Immunology:** Elias Alsabti  
**Physics:** Jan Hendrik Schon  
**Plant biology:** Richard Walden  
**Veterinary Medicine:** Hwang Woo Suk

The case you have just read involves a straightforward example of research misconduct. "Research misconduct" is a technical phrase used to refer to unethical activities. The US federal government narrowly circumscribes the use of the phrase to refer to any of three acts (but only these three acts):

Falsification of data: “Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.”

Fabrication of data: “Making up data or results and recording or reporting them”

Plagiarism: “Appropriating another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.”

These definitions derive from the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) Office of Research Integrity (ORI). ORI goes on to add two important qualifications. First, the definition also includes "other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting or reporting research." Second, the definition "does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.”

What do these definitions mean? Here is how NC State explains plagiarism:

- Submitting written materials without proper acknowledgement of the source
- Deliberate attribution to, or citation of, a source from which the referenced material was not in fact obtained
- Submitting data which have been altered or contrived in such a way as to be deliberately misleading

And what does *that* mean? It means highlighting a phrase or paragraph from the web and copying it and pasting it into your paper without quoting the material or citing the reference. It means downloading a paper for free from a website like "essaysfree.com," putting your name on
it, and submitting it as your own. Yes, it is plagiarism to submit such papers even if you have swapped one of your own papers for it. Yes, it is plagiarism even if you had to pay for it.

Why is plagiarism such a big deal? It seems ethically wrong for at least three reasons. First, it fails to show respect. When we pursue a PhD we enter an implicit social contract, an unwritten agreement that we will do our own work, assume responsibility for our own research results, and not appropriate the work of others as our own. Not to fulfill these implied promises is to disrespect our colleagues. Furthermore, our professional codes forbid dishonesty and disrespect, so cheating offends our group's rules and calls into question our sincerity in being a member of the group.

Second, cheating has bad consequences. It cheapens the value of the degree one earns, if one earns it; it poisons the laboratory atmosphere, causing people to guard their work and mistrust others; and it makes it more likely that the cheater will break promises and plagiarize the work of others in the future. If cheating were to become widespread at an institution, the value of the graduate degrees granted by that institution would also be diminished. There may be legal consequences, too. For example, the state of North Carolina regards cheating as a Class 2 misdemeanor:


It shall be unlawful for any person...to assist any student...or attempt to assist any student, in obtaining...by fraudulent means, any academic credit, grade or test score...in any course of study in any university....The activity prohibited by this subsection includes, but is not limited to, preparing or advertising, offering, or attempting to prepare a term paper, thesis, or dissertation for another, impersonating...another in taking or attempting to take an examination, and the...offering to give or change a grade or test score in exchange for an article of value or money. Clearly, there are many negative, and few positive, effects of cheating.

Third, it undermines a sense of community. Universities are, on the whole, civil places where diverse people pursue goals of a better life while being exposed to ideas and traditions unlike those with which they were raised. If the ordinary fabricator of data, Emily, could guarantee that no one would ever discover her deception, then she might not be guilty of threatening this spirit of cooperation and working together to mutual advantage. But Emily cannot make that guarantee; she cannot insure that others will never find her out. And if they find her out, they may cheat. If they cheat, others may cheat as well. Eventually, the spirit of trust and collegiality so essential to research and scientific progress will be badly frayed.

Since the price of cheating is steep, it is important that we remove as many ambiguities as possible. There are gray areas when it comes to quoting and attributing others' work. Much depends on context. For example, the work of government researchers cannot be copyrighted and is freely available for use. Entrepreneurs have been known to print entire government publications and sell them. Perfectly legal. In the business world, complete contracts, letters,
and instruction manuals may be copied verbatim with only the addressee's name changed. Perfectly legal.

Our context is the university, which is dedicated to academic freedom in the creation and communication of knowledge. Freedom of communication is maximized when we respect each our colleagues' work and cite their achievements. We stand on many shoulders in our endeavors, but the willingness to let others stand on your shoulders diminishes when they act as if their legs reach all the way to the ground. Research depends on trust and good will. Trust and good will in the university context depends on scrupulous attention to giving credit where credit is due.

When someone cheats in class, plagiarizes, or falsifies data, they inhibit the atmosphere of trust necessary to the proper functioning of research. In its Code of Student Conduct, North Carolina State University defines these activities. What it means to make up or change data is self-evident. Defining plagiarism, however, is not as easy. The NC State Code defines it as "submitting written materials without proper acknowledgement of the source." But what is proper acknowledgment? Is it plagiarism if I use a three or four word phrase from someone's paper and do not cite them? Probably not. However, a rough rule of thumb is that the source of a seven or eight word phrase probably should be quoted and referenced.

That said, remember that these are only rules of thumb. When the ideas being discussed are common, there may not be more than one way to say something. Consider this example:

"...that they may represent defects in the..."

As Henry Schaffer points out, it is difficult to find substitutes for the first three words, or for the last two. And, he concludes, "Using the word 'represent' may be plagiarism, but I'm not sure what other word than 'defects' I'd use there. I'm afraid that people writing on the same topic are bound to have strings of words that are similar or identical."

One way to gain clarity in this area is to look at particular examples. Complete one of the following exercises.

Life sciences:  [www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/PlagiarismBronson.htm](http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/PlagiarismBronson.htm)

Engineering:  [http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/documents/PlagiarismECE.pdf](http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/documents/PlagiarismECE.pdf)

Humanities:  [http://education.indiana.edu/%7Efrick/plagiarism/item1.html](http://education.indiana.edu/%7Efrick/plagiarism/item1.html)

General:  [www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/Plagiarismexercises.htm](http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/langure/Plagiarismexercises.htm)

We are now in a position to try to define ethics and distinguish it from a few of its close neighbors.

Ethics is the intellectual attempt to decide which action one has the best moral reasons to undertake, irrespective of the traditions one has been taught. On this definition, there is a difference between what we might call the moralities, or norms, of various groups--morali
such as those of the Jains of India, the Yoruba of Nigeria, or the Southern Baptists of Texas—and what we might call (admittedly grandiosely) "true" morality, which is universal, impartial, and applies to everyone. On this definition, "true" morality does not instruct George in Texas that it is permissible to kill and eat a cow in circumstances q, r, and s, while telling Kofe in Nigeria that it is impermissible to kill and eat a cow in the same set of circumstances.

Distinguishing between moralities, which can vary, and true morality, which cannot vary, provides us with one conceptual tool with which to try to explain what Jains are doing when they criticize Christians for undervaluing animal life. Jains disagree ethically with Christians; Jains believe Christians have the best reasons to undertake actions that highly value animal life even though this attitude is not part of the morality the Christians inherited.

D. CUSTOMS

Distinguishing between "moralities" and "true morality" helps to bring into focus the difference between ethics and custom. We sometimes perform actions out of habit that are not ethically justifiable. Some taxi drivers customarily give blank receipts to their fares on the understanding that the person will inflate the price paid, receive a higher amount in reimbursement from their company, and pass a bit along to the taxi driver. The mere fact that drivers and customers act this way does not make it right for them to do so, just as the fact that some people beat their horses does not make it right to torture animals. Then again, separating moralities from ethics (true morality), allows us to observe that some actions that are not customary are not necessarily unethical. We do not usually explain the sordid details of a recent divorce proceeding to strangers who casually ask us how we are doing, but it is not immoral to do so. There appears to be a real difference between customs, on the one hand, and ethically justifiable customs, on the other. True morality and customs, therefore, are not the same thing.

On this definition of ethics, there are real conflicts among the world’s moralities; societies have some moral beliefs that contradict some moral beliefs of other societies. If this is true, then one can no more settle such ethical disputes by invoking one's own inherited beliefs than one can determine the value of pi by saying "I was taught that pi equals 3.14." The value of pi is determined by the mathematical facts; the value of pi is not determined by what our teacher happened to tell us.

If ethical disputes cannot be settled by consulting any particular moral tradition or accepted beliefs or customs, how can they be settled? Perhaps by turning to the law.

E. LAW

“Are morality and the law the same thing?”

Some hold that a society's morality is reducible to whatever laws a society adopts for itself. Law is indeed not only a body of rules governing how people ought to behave, but a tutor, helping to instruct and encourage good behavior.
But here, again, there is a problem in conflating morality with a close neighbor. Societies can adopt laws that are clearly unethical (e.g., requiring African-Americans in Alabama to sit in the back of a bus), and societies can fail to classify as illegal actions that are clearly immoral (e.g., allowing cruel psychological abuse of a child or spouse). Therefore, some things are legal but clearly unethical, and some things are illegal but not necessarily immoral.

While communities should strive to form laws in accordance with ethical standards, we should not automatically assume that the one can be collapsed into the other. As there is between ethics and customs, there is a gap between ethics and the law. Morality and the law, therefore, are not the same thing.

Nor are science and ethics the same thing.

F. SCIENCE

The sciences are descriptive disciplines aimed at explaining and predicting in which we try to discover and articulate natural laws and regularities that in fact govern the behavior and relationships of objects in the natural world. We commonly believe that scientific laws are discovered in the world, and that science provides real knowledge about the actual workings of nature. Ethics, on the other hand, is a normative discipline aimed at prescribing conduct, in which we try to discover and articulate moral laws that ought to govern human behavior. This understanding of ethics raises many questions. Insofar as ethics is unlike science in this fundamental way, might it be that ethical rules are socially constructed, that is, simply invented by individuals and groups that cook up these rules? Is ethics not, therefore, completely unscientific? Unfortunately, we do not have time here to pursue these perplexing and critical questions.

G. PROFESSIONAL CODES

Let us summarize. We have provisionally defined ethics as an attempt to decide which action one has the best moral reasons to undertake irrespective of the traditions one has been taught. We have begun to examine the ways in which ethical reasoning focuses on decisions and choices we make that involve potential or real harms to individuals’ interests. And we have noted the way that customs and upbringing typically instruct us in the virtues, giving rise to laws and professional codes. Finally, we have noted the difference between the normative exploration that goes on in ethics and the empirical investigation that goes on in science.

BRANCHES OF ETHICS

Ethics is a sub-discipline of philosophy. It includes descriptive ethics, the empirical study of what people actually believe and value. Descriptive ethics involves psychological, sociological, and anthropological inquiry into the ethical values displayed both in what people say they ought to do and what they actually do. Meta-ethics involves philosophical inquiry into the foundations of ethical judgments and ethical theories. How are ethical judgments ultimately justified? Is the basis of ethics found in God’s will? Or in evolution? Or in moral intuitions or facts?
Practical ethics involves both empirical and philosophical inquiry. In it, we try to determine what is the right course of action, and what things are good. Practical ethics is the branch of moral philosophy that analyzes arguments about good and bad states of affairs, and right and wrong actions.

We will spend a good deal of our time in this course looking at issues in practical ethics: research misconduct, inappropriate mentoring relationships, conflicts of interest, and so on. In each of these areas, our universities have developed policies to regulate behaviors in these areas. But how are these policies justified? What is their basis? To answer this question we must first do a bit of meta-ethics and look at some ethical theories.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

There are several ethical principles we might consider. They include--on the one hand, Relativism (the principle that there is no objective truth in ethics, only the subjective truths constructed by one's society), and -- on the other end of the spectrum -- the Divine Command Theory (the principle that there is objective truth in ethics, established by God). Given the time constraints of the class, we will not be able to delve into these two intriguing principles. Rather, we will consider four principles that have emerged in the last two centuries as some of the most robust and promising:

1. A person ought to do what is in their own long-term best interests.
2. A person ought to do what their group considers to be admirable, just, etc.
3. A person ought to do what will maximize aggregate happiness and satisfy all interests.
4. A person ought to respect each individual's moral rights.

Each of these principles is grounded in an ethical theory: Egoism, Virtue theory, Utilitarianism, and Moral rights respectively. The theories provide justification for the principles by giving answers to three key questions:

What is good?
How should I act with respect to the good?
Why should I act ethically?

The first theory we will discuss, Egoism, provides a strong answer to the last question. Why should I act ethically? Because it is in my own interest to do so. Egoism holds that a person ought to do what is in their own long-term best interests. The theory counsels that I focus on my ultimate goals, the goals that make my life meaningful. The major weakness with the theory is that it seems arbitrarily prejudiced toward one person’s interests (namely, mine).

Virtue theory provides a strong answer to the first question; the good is what we have been taught by our loving parents, teachers, friends, and religions. The good is found in courage, honesty, responsibility. Virtue theory holds that a person ought to do what their group regards as exhibiting good character. The theory counsels that I focus on my group, or my professions rules: to be honest, fair, law-abiding, responsible, etc. The major weakness with the theory is that it seems to make it impossible to criticize the group’s rules.
Utilitarianism provides a strong, but different, answer to the first question. The good is pleasure, or happiness, or the satisfaction of our overall best interests. Utilitarianism holds that a person ought to do what will maximize the overall best consequences for everyone. It counsels that we consider equally the like interests of all individuals affected by our actions. Its major weakness is that it seems to undervalue the weight of our special attachments to those nearest and dearest to us.

Moral rights theories provide a powerful answer to the second question: I should always act to respect each individual’s moral rights. Rights theorists hold that each person is an autonomous individual with the ability to make their own choices. They advise that we never harm individuals or over-ride their rights, even if our aim is to secure benefits for the greatest number. The major weakness of this theory is that it seems to have a difficult time justifying the existence of rights claims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical theory</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Practical advice</th>
<th>Research ethics case</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Egoism</td>
<td>A person ought to do what is in their own long-term best interests.</td>
<td>Focus on my ultimate goal.</td>
<td>Choosing a lab.</td>
<td>Seems to be arbitrarily prejudiced toward one person's interests (mine).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Virtue theory</td>
<td>A person ought to do what their group regards as exhibiting good character.</td>
<td>Observe my profession's rules; be honest, fair, law-abiding, responsible.</td>
<td>Professional codes.</td>
<td>Seems to make it impossible to criticize the group's rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Utilitarianism</td>
<td>A person ought to do what will maximize overall best consequences for everyone.</td>
<td>Consider equally the like interests of all individuals affected by my actions.</td>
<td>Use of humans and animals.</td>
<td>Seems to undervalue the weight of our attachment to those nearest and dearest to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moral rights</td>
<td>A person ought to respect each individual's moral rights.</td>
<td>Never harm an individual in order to secure benefits for others.</td>
<td>Intellectual property.</td>
<td>Seems to have a difficult time justifying the existence of rights claims.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Four ethical principles

In the next few lectures we will explore these principles and theories in more detail with our eye on their usefulness to solve problems in research ethics.
Appendix 1: Incomplete arguments

An argument consists of a set of premises that are supposed to support a conclusion. In order for an argument to be sound, it must not be incomplete. Below is a set of incomplete arguments. Your task is to add the necessary premise (or premises) that will make the premises of the argument support the conclusion. Do not concern yourself with whether you agree with the premises or conclusions. Your only job is to add the missing premise that will make the premises support the conclusion.

(1) Premise: Non-human animals suffer, have thoughts, and feel pain.
   Conclusion: Therefore, killing non-human animals is morally wrong.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(2) Premise: It's morally wrong to treat human beings as mere objects.
   Conclusion: So, genetically engineering human beings is morally wrong.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(3) Premise: The state ought to license all activities that can cause great harm.
   Conclusion: So, the state ought to require a license for all agricultural biotechnology.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(4) Premise: It is biologically natural for humans to eat animal flesh.
   Conclusion: Therefore, it is morally permissible for humans to eat animal flesh.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(5) Premise: For transnational corporations to patent genes taken from developing countries is a form of theft.
   Conclusion: For this reason, it is morally wrong for transnational corporations to patent genes taken from developing countries.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(6) Premise: It is our moral duty to provide food for future generations.
   Conclusion: It follows that it is our moral duty to genetically engineer crops.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(7) Premise: It is morally wrong to engage in activities that undermine the natural order of things.
   Conclusion: Hence, genetic engineering is morally wrong.
   **Missing premise:** ________________________________________________

(8) Premise: Making transgenic animals fails to maximize the balance of happiness over unhappiness.
   **Conclusion:** ________________________________________________
Conclusion: Thus, it is ethically unacceptable to make transgenic animals.

Missing premise: __________________________________________________

Adapted by Gary Comstock from an exercise written by Michael Bishop, Iowa State University
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1 The next 3 paragraphs are reprinted from Gary Comstock, Life Science Ethics, ISU Press, ch. 1?, pp. xx-yy.

2 Note that “the provisions of this section shall not apply to the acts of one student in assisting another student as herein defined if the former is duly registered in an educational institution in North Carolina and is subject to the disciplinary authority thereof.”

3 www.ncsu.edu/policies/student_services/student_discipline/POL11.35.1.php