

## Summary Post

The case study of Abi highlights major concerns about accuracy and integrity in submitting research findings evaluating the nutritional value of the cereal Whizzz. As stated in the initial post, Abi has a dilemma in objectively delivering unfavourable data concerning a cereal's nutritional worth to the manufacturer. He has an ethical obligation to report comprehensive and fair facts, even if it opposes the interests of the company. Withholding or manipulating findings would be unethical and might result in legal ramifications (Dal-Ré et al., 2020).

Ibrahim (2023) correctly points out the challenges organizations encounter when balancing their obligations to shareholders and the general public. Manufacturers pursue profit, but ethical guidelines support transparency and accountability. Majola (2023) underlines Abi's fundamental dilemma between maintaining integrity and fulfilling corporate interests. It suggests further examination of potential alternatives for Abi to manage his ethical dilemma and research obligations.

According to norms such as the BCS Code of Conduct (2022), Abi has an obligation as a researcher and statistical programmer to publish both positive and negative findings accurately. Additionally, fabricating or distorting data is not only unethical and goes against scientific standards, but it can also erode the public's trust in the integrity and honesty of research (Catano, 2007).

In conclusion, maintaining integrity and prioritizing public safety emerged as the key ethical priorities based on the initial post and peer-response discussions. Publishing all results, whether positive or negative, maintains ethics and advances public understanding. Abi is obligated to make ethical decisions, even if it means challenging corporate interests. The researcher's moral compass should prioritize honesty and transparency.

## References

BCS (2022) BCS Code of Conduct | BCS. Available from: <https://www.bcs.org/membership-and-registrations/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/> [Accessed 31 July 2023].

Catano, V. M., & Turk, J. (2007). Fraud and misconduct in scientific research: definition and procedures for investigation. *Medicine and Law* 26(3): 465-476. Available from: <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/mlv26&i=489> [Accessed 8 August 2023].

Dal-Ré, R., Bouter, L. M., Cuijpers, P., Gluud, C., & Holm, S. (2020) Should research misconduct be criminalized?. *Research Ethics* 16 (1–2): 1–12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747016119898400>.

Ibrahim, M. (2023). Collaborative Learning Discussion 2 Initial Post. Available from: <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=175575> [Accessed 20 August 2023].

Majola, N. (2023). Collaborative Learning Discussion 2 Initial Post. Available from: <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=175869> [Accessed 20 August 2023].