

Unit 7 Collaborative Discussion 2

Case Study: Accuracy of Information Summary

In the case study discussed over the past three weeks, we considered the various aspects researchers contend with during their research. The focus was on how researchers present their findings as accurately as possible, what to do if they are unable to, and potential approaches to maintaining high standards of research information.

Cascia and Racine (2018) present a toolkit to apply a person-oriented approach to help researchers adopt a border perspective of research ethics that goes beyond regulatory requirements. For them, it is essential to respect the personhood of participants, recommending that ethics board members use such a framework to evaluate proposed studies. Ashley (2021) considers that research fatigue plays a part in the accuracy of research information. They looked at its impact on accuracy and identified four points: concentration, the “burdensomeness of research”, the “usefulness of research”, and the psycho-social characteristic of participants. It is not easy to define what ethics means in research. Still, DuBois and Antes (2018) define it as “doing good science in a good manner” guided by a common standard of excellence. To them, research ethics encompasses five aspects: normative ethics (what is right and wrong), compliance, rigour and reproducibility, social value, and workplace relationships, while Pimple (2002) classifies six domains into three categories: truthfulness, fairness, and wisdom. In these classifications, two actors are involved, the researcher and the subject.

Therefore, ensuring accurate, reliable research information requires an ethical approach with both personal and social responsibility. Edgell (2022) states that although organisations provide guidelines, moral responsibility remains with researchers. I agree with this statement since researchers often contend with the need to present truthful and accurate research information. However, this is challenging if the information is unfavourable or may harm one or more groups. Students also considered that research must answer one or more research questions (Sigera, 2022), ensuring the information remains true to the question. It is another valuable point to aid researchers in presenting accurate information because it provides focus and guidance. Ultimately, researchers, like machines, require advice to limit the boundaries of what is ethical, such as a framework presented by Bonde et al. (2013)

References

- Ashley, F. (2021). Accounting for research fatigue in research ethics. *Bioethics*, 35(3), pp.270-276.
- Bonde, S., Firenze, P., Green, J., Grinberg, M., Krijn, J., Levoy, E., Naik, A., Ucik, L. & Weisberg, L. (2013). Available from <https://www.brown.edu/academics/science-and-technology-studies/framework-making-ethical-decisions> [Accessed 14 Aug 2022]
- Cascio, M.A. & Racine, E. (2018). Person-oriented research ethics: integrating relational and everyday ethics in research. *Accountability in research*, 25(3), pp.170-197.
- DuBois, J.M. & Antes, A.L. (2018). Five dimensions of research ethics: A stakeholder framework for creating a climate of research integrity. *Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 93(4):550.
- Edgell, T. (2022). Discussion Summary Post. Available from <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/hsuforum/discuss.php?d=320590>. [Accessed 14 Aug 2022]
- Pimple, K.D. (2002). Six domains of research ethics. *Science and engineering ethics*, 8(2):191-205.
- Sigera, S. (2022). Discussion Initial Post. Available from <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/hsuforum/discuss.php?d=319539> [Accessed 14 Aug 2022]