

Business research

[Business](#)



Business Research of Introduction Current times have realized an unprecedented increase in the number of trials and convictions related to unethical research practices by businesses, such as pharmaceutical companies. Although the relevant laws and regulations have been enacted and amended to help solve issues of unethical research conducts by individuals and businesses, the scandals still happen at a rather shocking rate (Eckart, 2006). This paper explores an example of the many unethical research practices that have led to the trial and conviction of individuals and corporate organizations.

Unethical Business Research

Since historical times, researchers have performed harmful experiments on fellow human beings, all for their selfish gains, disregarding the established rules, regulations and ethical principles (Eckart, 2006). What is more, these tests have been done illegally, minus the knowledge, consent, or even the informed consent of participants. For instance, study subjects have been injected with deadly or debilitating pathogens, exposed to deadly biological and chemical weapons, toxic and radioactive chemicals, surgical experiments, and mind-changing drugs (Eckart, 2006). Unfortunately, children are the most targeted and affected group in these experiments. This case study on unethical business research features a former gastroenterologist at Londons Royal Free Hospital named Andrew Wakefield. In 1998, Wakefield published in the Medical Journal Lancet, a study in which he linked the triple Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) vaccine with autism and bowel disorders in children. In addition to this publication, Wakefield made public statements that made the public to panic and avoid the vaccine.

Later, the study by Wakefield would be discredited and the MMR vaccine declared safe for use. In fact, the UK authorities later discovered that the manner in which the gastroenterologist had conducted his research was unethical (Harrell, 2010). According to the General Medical Council's ruling, Wakefield had conducted himself not only dishonestly but also irresponsibly with an uncaring disregard for the child-participants. Nonetheless, Wakefield would term the ruling unjust and state that he had no regrets over his findings. The General Medical Council criticized Wakefield for various misconducts including his use of invasive tests such as colonoscopies and spinal taps on the children with utter disregard to the side effects of these methods on the children and his method of obtaining blood samples by bribing the children with \$8 during his son's birthday (Harrell, 2010). Additionally, Wakefield was criticized because he did not reveal that he was paid by the lawyers of parents who believed that the MMR vaccine had caused their children to have autism (Harrell, 2010). The children involved in the study were thus the main people affected by the unethical research conducts by Mr. Wakefield. The public was the other affected party since people shunned the vaccine in the years following the publication of Wakefield's findings, resulting in an increase in cases of measles, which hit 1370 in 2008 compared to the 56 cases in 1998.

Conclusion

This unethical research conduct by Wakefield and the ruling of the General Medical Council calls upon researchers to be professional and not to report bias research findings to appease those funding their studies. That is, professional researchers should remain so, doing what is in the best interest of the public and not for individuals or groups with vested interests, which is <https://assignbuster.com/business-research-essay-samples/>

covering the expenses. It is only by adhering to the rules, regulations, and the principles governing a profession and research that such unethical research conducts may be addressed.

References

Eckart, W. U. (2006). *Man, medicine, and the state: the human body as an object of government sponsored medical research in the 20th century*. Franz Steiner Verlag.

Harrell, B. (2010). “ Doctor in MMR-Autism Scare Ruled Unethical.” *Time Health*. Retrieved on August 30, 2012 from <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1957656,00.html>