

# Research Methods and Professional Practice August 2023 B

[Home](#) / / [My courses/](#) / [RMPP\\_PCOM7E August 2023 B](#) / / [Unit 1](#) / / [Collaborative Learning Discussion 1](#) /  
/ [Initial post](#) /



## Collaborative Learning Discussion 1

### Initial post

 [Settings](#) ▼

[◀ Initial Post](#)

[Summary Post ▶](#)

Display replies in nested form



#### Initial post

by [Ashok Kumar Shanmugam](#) - Wednesday, 16 August 2023, 3:28 AM



There are multiple breaches of the British Computer Society's (BCS) Code of Conduct in the case study (ACM, N.D.) in which a technical leader acted abusively against a team member at work (BCS, 2022).

Primarily, it is evident that the technical leader, Max, engages in gender-biased conduct by excluding the names of female researchers and collaborators from the authorship list of the publications submitted to the journals. The presence of prejudice in his attitude might perhaps be attributed to his personal connection with the one who is the recipient of his abusive conduct, namely Diana.

In accordance with the first tenet of the BCS Code of Conduct, IT professionals are obligated to refrain from engaging in discriminatory practises on the basis of gender. The Code of Ethics established by the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM, 2018) also reflects the same notion. In addition to the ethical ramifications, Max's conduct also has some legal concerns. As per the provisions outlined in the Equality Act of 2010, it is established that sex is recognised as one of the protected characteristics. It is obvious from the case study that the discriminatory activity shown is in clear violation of the law.

Max's conduct also violates the fourth pillar of the BCS Code of Conduct (2022), which mandates that IT professionals must exhibit support towards their peers and foster the growth and advancement of other professionals in their field. However, Max's failure to acknowledge and appreciate the diligent efforts of others clearly indicates a lack of helpful attitude in this regard.

In summary, the case study serves as a compelling illustration of how instances of abusive conduct persist inside an organisation when not promptly and effectively addressed by upper-level management

What is research?

Research is a systematic and rigorous investigation conducted to explore a specific issue or research question, using scientific methodologies (questionpro, 2021).

Inductive approaches include the analysis of observable events, while deductive methods are used to validate the observed events. Inductive methodologies are generally linked to qualitative research, while deductive procedures are mostly connected with quantitative analysis (questionpro, 2021).

## References:

ACM (N.D.). Code: Abusive Workplace Behavior. Available from: <https://ethics.acm.org/code-of>



ACM (N.D.) Case. Abusive workplace Behavior. Available from: <https://ethics.acm.org/code-of-ethics/using-the-code/case-abusive-workplace-behavior/> [Accessed 10 August 2023].

ACM (2018) ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Available from: <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics> [Accessed 10 August 2023].

BCS (2022) BCS Code of Conduct. Available from: <https://www.bcs.org/media/2211/bcs-code-of-conduct.pdf> [Accessed 13 August 2023].

Equality Act 2010, c. 15. United Kingdom. Available from: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents> [Accessed 14 August 2023].

QuestionPro. (2021) What is research? Available from: <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/what-is-research/> [Accessed 14 August 2023]

[Permalink](#) [Reply](#)



### Re: PEER RESPONSE

by [Amit Pahuja](#) - Monday, 21 August 2023, 2:42 AM

Hello Ashok,

Thanks for the great post!

Your introduction provides a comprehensive summary of the situation involving Max's abusive conduct and violations of the BCS Code of Conduct. It establishes the context for discussing the violations and their consequences.



violations and their consequences.

The analysis of Max's prejudiced behavior is well-explained. You provide specific examples of his conduct and connect it to the BCS Code of Conduct and the ACM Code of Ethics. Mentioning the personal connection to Diana enriches your analysis.

Your explanation of the legal issues surrounding Max's behavior is consistent with the 2010 Equality Act. Connecting discriminatory conduct to violations of the law strengthens your argument. Consider providing some more detail regarding the specific Equality Act provisions that are being violated. You effectively cite the fourth pillar of the BCS Code of Conduct and provide clear justification for why Max's conduct violates it. This section could benefit from illustrative instances of how Max fails to stand with his peers, which would strengthen your case.

The conclusion highlights the significance of addressing abusive behavior in organizations and the role of senior management. It may be helpful to elaborate on the potential repercussions of ignoring such conduct, both for the individuals involved and for the workplace as a whole.

Your definition of research as a methodical inquiry is accurate. However, you could elaborate on the purpose of research, which is typically to generate new information, address problems, or contribute to a particular field.

Overall, your piece of writing is nicely organized and addresses the highlighted points effectively.

#### References:

ACM (N.D.) Case: Abusive Workplace Behavior. Available at: <https://ethics.acm.org/code-of-ethics/using-the-code/case-abusive-workplace-behavior/> [Accessed 18 August 2023].

BCS (2022). BCS Code of Conduct. <https://www.bcs.org/media/2211/bcs-code-of-conduct.pdf> [Accessed 18 August 2023].

[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Reply](#)



#### Re: PEER RESPONSE

by [Jason Rigas](#) - Monday, 28 August 2023, 7:37 AM

Dear Ashok,

Thank you for your post. As I was reading it I was trying to think which areas of the code of conducted have been breached in this case of abusive behaviour. By looking into the code I was



surprised to see how a single behaviour breaches so many of the provisions in the code.

Public Interest:

Principle 1.a: Max does not show regard for the well-being of Diane by verbally abusing her and excluding her from the team's activities. This could affect Diane's mental and emotional well-being.

Principle 1.c: Max's targeting of only women team members violates this principle, which mandates not discriminating on the grounds of sex.

Professional Competence and Integrity:

Principle 2.f: Max's malicious actions and inactions toward Diane and other women team members are directly injuring their reputation and employment.

Principle 2.g: While the exact nature isn't mentioned, any unethical inducement or manipulation to exert control over team members might fall under this category.

Duty to the Profession:

Principle 4.a: Max's actions, especially if made public, could tarnish the reputation of the IT profession.

Very often we tend to focus on individual cases within companies and to single them out as unfortunate but isolated cases. Jean's behaviour shows that in this case such a behaviour is tolerated in general within the company and is clearly a sign of a failing organisational culture (Schein, 2010). It is therefore important not only to focus on individual cases but to examine the wider context in which such violations take place and the wider responsibility of companies.

#### References

ACM (2018). ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct.

BCS (2022). BCS Code of Conduct.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational Culture and Leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Smith, J. L., & Hart, J. K. (2011). The Psychology of Workplace Behavior. Cambridge University Press.

[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Reply](#)



**Re: Initial post**

by [Jonathan Ajodo](#) - Monday, 21 August 2023, 6:15 AM

Thank you for your submission. The situation described presents a number of ethical, legal, social, and professional concerns related to the actions of the individuals involved. In terms of the British Computer Society (BCS) Code of Conduct, Max's behaviour, which includes berating team members and removing their names from publications as punishment, undermines the public interest by creating a hostile work environment and potentially compromising the quality of the team's work. His behaviour violates the principles of integrity and professionalism. He is not upholding the code's standard of treating colleagues with respect, and his focus on self-promotion may compromise the accuracy and quality of the team's research. Furthermore, I agree that the mention that women team members have had their names removed from publications highlights a potential gender bias and unequal treatment, which could lead to legal claims of discrimination. The hostile environment can have serious impacts on the mental health and well-being of team members, potentially leading to legal claims related to employee well-being. However, you did not highlight the team manager's response which does not align with the duty to follow relevant rules and regulations within the organization. The behaviour described, including verbal abuse and removal of names from publications, may be in violation of workplace standards.

[Permalink](#)   [Show parent](#)   [Reply](#)

[◀ Initial Post](#)

[Summary Post ▶](#)

