

Research Methods and Professional Practice

June 2022

[Home](#) / / [My courses/](#) / [RMPP_PCOM7E June 2022](#) / / [Unit 7](#) / / [Collaborative Learning Discussion 2](#) /
/ [Initial Post](#) /

« Collaborative Learning Discussion 2



[Pavendran Wimalendran](#)

Initial Post

22 days ago

1 reply



Last 21 hours ago



Research must be driven by a specific question that has to be addressed without bias (Alfonsi, 2012), yet it is possible for industry-funded studies to provide findings that could promote the industry's objectives (Bekelman et al., 2003). Therefore, in this scenario, it is vital that Abi analyse the data truthfully and report the results in an unbiased manner

Abi is bound by an ethics code as an independent researcher. This involves refuting any biased assertions made in light of his research. He owes it to his profession to protect his name and reputation from being tarnished by those who intentionally attempt to skew his results in one way or the other.

“Whistle blowing” The expression is frequently used to describe drawing attention to wrongdoing or to information that has been withheld but could reveal a potentially dangerous product. (Brabeck, 1984). If Abi submits both sets of results but the manufacturer only releases the favourable ones, he may decide to come forward as a whistle blower and contact the food standards agency or make his findings public, although doing so may be risky because the manufacturer may sue him for defamation.

Bekelman JE, Li Y, Gross CP (2003) Scope and impact of financial conflicts of interest in biomedical research: a systematic review. *JAMA* 289: 454–465.

Alfonsi (2012) Guidance Note – Ethics and Food-Related Research, Ethics Review and Food-Related Research, pp. 4–6, 23–25. Available from:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/fp7/89847/research-food_en.pdf [accessed: 10 Aug 2022]

Brabeck, M., 1984. Ethical characteristics of whistle blowers. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18(1), pp.41-53.

Reply

Minimum rating: -

1 reply

1



New

Post by [Sathira Padukka](#)

[21 hours ago](#)

Re: Initial Post

Your post was an interesting read. I do agree with the fact that researchers should not be biased when drawing conclusions to present their findings.

Reviewers should anticipate the kinds of bias that might affect a given report's outcome while evaluating a product, and they should form conclusions without ignoring the reality of science. Due to the media's exaggeration of nutritional research, it is essential to look at related studies and the methodology employed in order to produce the most logical and accurate findings. Even if the results show a negative impact on the manufacturer, the reviewer is still allowed to conduct the evaluation ethically and to communicate the results honestly.

References

Resnik, D. (2020). *What is ethics in research & why is it important?* [online] National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. Available at: <https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis/index.cfm>.

ResearchArticles.com (2019). *What is Accuracy in Research?* [online] Helping Research writing for student & professional researchers. Available at: <http://researcharticles.com/index.php/accuracy-research/>.

[Reply](#)

Add your reply



Your subject

Type your post

Choose files No file chosen

Submit

[Use advanced editor and additional options](#)

OLDER DISCUSSION

[Summary Post](#)

NEWER DISCUSSION

[Initial Post](#)