Collaborative Learning Discussion 2

My Submission

Abi's ethical dilemma touches upon fundamental principles of research integrity, particularly in fields directly impacting public health, like nutritional science. As a researcher and statistical programmer, Abi faces the ethical challenge of how to present his findings responsibly, especially when the data could be interpreted in various ways.

Ethically, researchers are expected to adhere to the principle of integrity by presenting data honestly and comprehensively, regardless of potential pressure from sponsors to skew results favourably. According to the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (2009), researchers must avoid deceptive practices such as selective reporting or presenting data in a way that misleads stakeholders about the true nature of the findings.

Abi is ethically obligated to present both the positive and negative analyses if both are statistically valid and derived from the same data set. This aligns with the ethical principles of objectivity and integrity in scientific reporting. The Office of Research Integrity highlights the importance of honesty and accuracy in communicating research findings to ensure the credibility and utility of scientific knowledge (Steneck, 2007).

Furthermore, while Abi may not be directly responsible for how others use his research, he holds a duty to ensure that his findings are not misrepresented. One way to do this is by ensuring that all interpretations, both positive and negative, are available and clearly communicated. This could involve publishing the full results in an academic journal where peer review and public access mitigate the risks of selective reporting.

Socially and professionally, the consequences of misrepresenting research findings can be significant, impacting public health, Abi's reputation, and the credibility of his institution. Legally, while specific laws governing the manipulation of research data vary by jurisdiction, unethical conduct can lead to professional sanctions and damage trust in the scientific community.

In considering alternative courses of action, Abi could disclose both sets of results to the manufacturer and clearly communicate the implications of each analysis. Additionally, he could seek guidance from ethical review boards or consult with colleagues to ensure that his actions uphold ethical standards and promote the integrity of the research process.

In conclusion, Abi should report all valid findings of his analysis on Whizzz, making sure that he communicates them responsibly to prevent misuse. By adhering to these ethical practices, Abi contributes to the integrity and reliability of scientific research.

References

Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (U.S.), 2009. *On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research*, 3rd ed. National Academies Press. Available at: https://research.jefferson.edu/content/dam/university/research/compliance/On%20Being%20a%20Scientist.pdf [Accessed 17 April 2024].

Steneck, N.H., 2007. *ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research*. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at: ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research | ORI - The Office of Research Integrity [Accessed 17 April 2024].