

# Research Methods and Professional Practice January 2022

[Home](#) / / [My courses](#) / / [RMPP\\_PCOM7E January 2022](#) / / [Unit 7](#) / / [Collaborative Learning Discussion 2](#) /  
/ [Initial Post](#) /

## « Collaborative Learning Discussion 2



[Yibeltal Mengesha](#)

### Initial Post

17 hours ago

1 reply



Last now

At first glance, studying the impact of a Whizzz cereal might seem a new topic for scientific world. But these days, researchers are focusing more and more on solving real-world problems – understanding what works and what does not, and what benefits more. Yes Abi obligated to present both the positive and the negative analyses to manufacturer (Moren K, 2019).

Before any study initiated, the researcher sets up a hypothesis in mind. Many a times, the researcher knows what he/she wants and therefore, this will influence the study results. Hence, it is prudent to confirm the effect of any intervention by repeating it in different laboratories/conditions by various researchers. Based on the research outcome it is ethical for him to suggest analyzing correct data in a way that supports two or more different conclusions with revision of methodology and possible scientific justification; When done so, the subsequent studies may either contradict or may show reduced or stronger effect size than the earlier ones (Grindrod, P. & Moreno, J,2018).

Manufacturer may publicize only the positive on even if unethical but Abi should use different mechanisms to communicate his research output with different stakeholders using presentation, publication and so on additionally he have to recommend and invite researcher for further study on Whizzz cereal.

### Reference

Grindrod, P. & Moreno, J., 2018. Code of conduct. Available at: <http://www.code-of-ethics.org/code-of-conduct> [Accessed on March 2022].

Kate Moren, 2019. Interpreting Contradictory UX Research Findings. Available at: <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/interpreting-research-findings> [Accessed on 12 March 2022]

The truth wears off is there something wrong with the scientific method, 2011. Available at: [http://www.neurofly.com/NeuroSeminar\\_files.pdf](http://www.neurofly.com/NeuroSeminar_files.pdf) [Accessed on March 2022].



**Reply****1 reply**

1

Post by [Jan Kűfner](#)*Peer response*[now](#)

Publishing the complete result herself, when Whizz is only publishing favorable results is a very good route to follow. There is however a more powerful alternative:

As per Legal framework for European statistics Article 2 statistical principles (1c) the statistics must also be distributed in an impartial way. This requires the company to provide the study in an unbiased way. By removing the unfavorable conclusion, the company would be in violation of European law and could therefore be sued by Abi. This legal way would give Abi or others in knowledge of the mis-doing of the company, a very strong possibility to ensure, that the correct and complete results are published. (Eurostat 2010)

References:

Eurostat (2010) Legal framework for European statistics – The Statistical Law Available from <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-statistical-books/-/ks-31-09-254> [Accessed 12.03.2022]

**Reply.**[Edit](#) [Delete](#)

Minimum rating: -

Add your reply



Your subject

Type your post

Dateien auswählen Keine ausgewählt

**Submit**[Use advanced editor and additional options](#)

OLDER DISCUSSION

[Initial Post](#)

