

Collaborative Discussion 2: Peer Response 2 (226 words)

Dear Daniel,

Thank you for your contribution to this discussion! I agree with your position that Abi should present the data as it is without distortion, and this position aligns with foundational research ethics principles. Any data manipulation would constitute as a questionable research practice (QRP) and research misconduct. However, it is critical to highlight that Abi is clear that data being manipulated is a definite ethical challenge, however in this scenario, it is the analysis methodology, i.e., the statistical approaches, that is used as a tool for manipulating the research results. This would go against the integrity of Abi as a researcher, and as you rightly highlighted, integrity upholds the scientific community and ensures reproducibility to progress future research (Shaw & Satalkar, 2018).

To enhance the discussion, as discussed above I would address the more nuanced issue of selective analysis that Abi is considering. Additionally, I would consider outlining any actionable advice for his specific situation beyond the general principle of not manipulating data. Going further, additional analysis of the potential legal, social, and professional impacts is necessary, especially given estimated prevalence of QRPs (Larsson et al., 2023).

To sum up, I encourage exploring the complexity of the scenario and the potential actions Abi can take in navigating the specific ethical dilemma presented in the case. You have rightly identified the fundamental ethical principle of data integrity.

References:

Larsson, T., Plonsky, L., Sterling, S., Kytö, M., Yaw, K. & Wood, M. (2023) On the frequency, prevalence, and perceived severity of questionable research practices. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 2(3), p.100064.

Shaw, D. & Satalkar, P. (2018) Researchers' interpretations of research integrity: A qualitative study. *Accountability in research*, 25(2): 79-93.