

Summary Post

◀ Initial Post

Summary Post ▶

Display replies in nested form

Settings ▾



Summary Post

by [Fahad Abdallah](#) - Monday, 30 June 2025, 5:29 PM

The case of Abi describes an essential ethical dilemma in contemporary research practice- the selective reporting of results, or epistemic manipulation. Even though no data can be falsified, selective reporting of only successful results and discouraging unsuccessful results can misinform stakeholders, negate the integrity of science, and put people at risk. That is the main issue in health-related studies, where even potentially technically accurate, incomplete reporting can harm the population and transgress ethical transparency (Hakimi et al., 2021). The problem is not only statistical validity. Amongst the ethical responsibilities that researchers pursue is to give the findings in context, whereby the data should be accurately reported and responsibly. They need to be made transparent and accountable, thus ensuring the safety of vulnerable populations and public confidence. This wider duty is served by responsible AI and ethical data documentation, such as the employment of Data Cards, to make any datasets and results clear, complete, and purposeful (Pushkarna et al., 2022).

Responses of peers stressed that integrity in research goes beyond acceptable methodology but entails a promise of full disclosure and non-maleficence. When dealing with education, health, or AI data, those practices require active mitigation to avoid situations of abuse or misinterpretation (Memarian & Doleck, 2023). Researchers should be cautious because what they produce can be misused selectively, and people can use parts of it and leave. It is the responsibility of the researchers to communicate clearly and with safeguards that are ethically dependent. The moral and right move that Abi should make is to make discoveries, both positive and negative results available, with straightforward commentaries to touch on potential risks and interpretations. He ought to get this published independently or inject disclaimers where this is required. Finally, an ethical research practice must entail character, responsibility, and voluntary openness to let the information benefit the population instead of any business.

References

Hakimi, L., Eynon, R., & Murphy, V. A. (2021). The ethics of using digital trace data in education: A thematic review of the research landscape. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(5), 671–717. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211020116> (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Memarian, B., & Doleck, T. (2023). Fairness, accountability, transparency, and ethics (FATE) in artificial intelligence (AI) and higher education: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100152. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100152> (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Pushkarna, M., Zaldivar, A., & Kjartansson, O. (2022). Data cards: Purposeful and transparent dataset documentation for responsible AI. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '22)* (pp. 1776–1826). ACM. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533231> (Accessed: 30 June 2025).

Maximum rating: -

Permalink Reply

◀ Initial Post

Summary Post ▶



[Site Accessibility Statement](#)
[Privacy Policy](#)

