Embedding Research Integrity From Proposal to Publication

Leticia Guinsiman

Abstract

Research ethics is frequently confined to informed consent forms or a final lecture on plagiarism. This conceptual article argues that integrity must instead be embedded across the complete research lifecycle. It presents a six-stage model covering problem selection, design, participant engagement, data stewardship, analysis and reporting, and publication. At each stage, ethical duties are translated into practical questions concerning social value, proportional burden, voluntary participation, privacy, documentation, honest inference, authorship, and correction of the record. The discussion distinguishes serious research misconduct from questionable practices and explains why formal compliance alone cannot guarantee trustworthy scholarship. Poorly designed studies may burden participants without producing interpretable knowledge, while selective reporting, undisclosed analytic changes, and exaggerated conclusions can distort the record without fabricating data. Particular attention is given to classroom and institution-level supports, including protocol rehearsal, data-management plans, decision logs, contribution statements, and transparent reporting checklists. Consent is treated as continuing communication, data openness as a balance among transparency, privacy, ownership, and risk, and publication as an obligation that continues through correction of material errors. The article concludes that integrity education is most effective when learners repeatedly practice ethical judgment within ordinary methodological decisions. Treating ethics as a continuous design criterion protects participants, improves evidentiary quality, supports fair credit, and strengthens public confidence in research.

Keywords: research integrity; informed consent; data stewardship; responsible conduct; publication ethics; ethics education

Introduction

Research integrity is often introduced through prohibitions: do not fabricate data, do not plagiarize, and do not involve people without consent. These rules are necessary, but they can create the mistaken impression that ethics is a checkpoint external to research design. In practice, ethical quality is produced or weakened through ordinary decisions—whose problem receives attention, who bears the burden of participation, what information is collected, how uncertainty is handled, and who receives credit.

International integrity guidance emphasizes honesty, accountability, professional courtesy, and stewardship as fundamental responsibilities (World Conferences on Research Integrity, 2010). These principles extend beyond avoiding fraud. A technically correct study may still be ethically weak if its question has little social value, its burden is disproportionate, its data practices are insecure, or its conclusions exceed the evidence.

This article presents a lifecycle approach to integrity education. It identifies ethical work at six stages from proposal to publication and suggests practices that institutions and instructors can integrate into research training. The central claim is that integrity becomes durable when it is rehearsed as part of methodological reasoning rather than isolated as a compliance topic.

Stage One: Selecting a Worthwhile Problem

Ethical inquiry begins before participant recruitment. A proposed study should have sufficient social, educational, scientific, or practical value to justify the time and risk it asks of others. Researchers should ask who defined the problem, who is expected to benefit, and whether the project unnecessarily duplicates accessible knowledge.

Problem selection also distributes attention. Communities may be studied repeatedly without receiving usable findings, while less visible concerns remain ignored. Engaging relevant stakeholders can improve both

the significance and appropriateness of the question. Engagement does not transfer scholarly responsibility to participants; it helps researchers understand consequences that may not be visible from outside the setting.

An ethics-oriented proposal therefore explains not only the gap in literature but also the value of filling it. This requirement discourages projects conducted solely for convenience or credential completion and makes explicit the reciprocity expected when people or communities contribute knowledge.

Stage Two: Designing Proportionate and Credible Inquiry

Poor design is an ethical issue because it can expose participants to burden without producing interpretable knowledge. The chosen sample, instrument, procedure, and analysis must be capable of addressing the research questions. Risks should be minimized, and any remaining risk should be proportionate to the prospective value of the study.

Independent review is important, but approval should not be treated as a substitute for researcher judgment. Protocols evolve in the field, unanticipated situations occur, and power relations cannot always be resolved by a form. Emanuel, Wendler, and Grady (2000) identify scientific validity, favorable risk-benefit balance, fair subject selection, independent review, informed consent, and respect for enrolled participants among the ethical requirements of research involving humans.

Students can practice this reasoning by conducting a protocol walk-through. For each procedure, they identify purpose, burden, privacy implications, possible distress, mitigation, and a stopping or referral plan. This exercise connects ethical questions directly to the method.

Stage Three: Respectful Participant Engagement

Consent is a process of communication, not merely a signature. Participants need understandable information about the study's purpose, procedures, expected duration, foreseeable risks, potential benefits, confidentiality limits, voluntariness, and avenues for questions. They should be able to decline or withdraw without inappropriate penalty.

Power differences require special attention. Students, employees, patients, or beneficiaries may feel compelled to participate when recruitment comes from a teacher, supervisor, clinician, or service provider. Alternative recruitment arrangements, neutral consent personnel, and clear separation of participation from grades, employment, or benefits can reduce undue influence.

Respect continues after enrollment. Researchers should honor agreed boundaries for recording, photography, quotation, and future use of data. In qualitative work, a quotation may identify a participant through context even after a name is removed. In small communities, combinations of role, location, and event can be revealing. Confidentiality planning should therefore consider deductive disclosure, not only direct identifiers.

Stage Four: Responsible Data Stewardship

Data stewardship covers collection, storage, access, documentation, sharing, retention, and disposal. Researchers should collect only what the study needs. Access should be limited according to role, sensitive files protected, and identifiers separated where feasible. A clear data-management plan states who controls the records, how versions are tracked, how long they will be retained, and what sharing was actually authorized.

Documentation supports both security and credibility. A codebook, decision log, audit trail, or analysis script allows the researcher to reconstruct how raw material became a finding. It also reduces the temptation to make undocumented changes when results are inconvenient. The FAIR principles encourage data to be findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable, while recognizing that accessibility must be governed appropriately (Wilkinson et al., 2016). Ethical openness is not indiscriminate disclosure; it balances transparency with consent, privacy, ownership, and risk.

Training should include realistic scenarios: a lost device, a request from a colleague, a participant who retracts a statement, or a dataset containing unexpected identifiers. Plans become meaningful when learners must apply them to decisions.

Stage Five: Honest Analysis and Reporting

Fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism are serious violations, but trustworthy reporting also requires attention to less dramatic practices. Selective omission, undisclosed analytic changes, misleading graphics, fragmented publication, and exaggerated conclusions can distort the record without inventing data.

Researchers should distinguish exploratory from confirmatory analysis, document deviations from plans, report relevant limitations, and preserve results that complicate the preferred narrative. Quantitative claims should reflect uncertainty and design limits. Qualitative accounts should show how interpretations were developed and how divergent material was considered. Transparency enables readers to judge evidence rather than rely on authority.

Reporting guidelines can prompt inclusion of the minimum information readers need to understand and assess a study. They are aids to completeness, not substitutes for judgment. The underlying ethical obligation is accurate representation: methods should be described as conducted, results as observed, and conclusions as warranted.

Stage Six: Fair Publication and Continuing Responsibility

Publication distributes credit and establishes an enduring record. Authorship should reflect substantial intellectual contribution and responsibility, not status, courtesy, or administrative power. Contribution discussions should occur early and be revisited as work changes. The CRediT taxonomy offers a structured vocabulary for roles such as conceptualization, methodology, data curation, analysis, writing, and supervision (Brand et al., 2015).

Authors should disclose relevant conflicts, avoid duplicate or redundant publication, cite sources fairly, and protect confidential information. Peer reviewers must preserve confidentiality and avoid using privileged ideas. Editors and institutions share responsibility for responding consistently to concerns.

Integrity continues after publication. Honest errors should be corrected promptly. More serious problems may require retraction or institutional investigation. Correction is not inherently evidence of bad faith; refusal to correct a material error is the deeper threat to trust. A healthy research culture treats the reliability of the record as more important than personal embarrassment.

Teaching Integrity as Repeated Practice

A single ethics seminar cannot carry the full burden of integrity education. Ethical judgment should recur in problem statements, proposal rubrics, consent rehearsals, data exercises, analysis workshops, authorship agreements, and manuscript review. Instructors can use short dilemmas tied to the stage students are currently completing.

Institutional supports also matter. Clear procedures, confidential consultation, fair workload, mentoring, secure infrastructure, and proportionate responses to mistakes shape behavior. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017) stresses that research integrity depends not only on individual character but also on environments and systems.

Assessment should test reasoning. Learners can be asked to identify affected parties, competing duties, available evidence, possible actions, and the justification for a decision. This approach recognizes that many ethical problems involve tensions rather than obvious villains.

Conclusion

Research integrity is not an appendix to method. It is the continuous discipline of producing knowledge in ways that respect people, preserve evidence, represent uncertainty honestly, allocate credit fairly, and correct the record when necessary.

The six-stage lifecycle model turns broad principles into practical questions from problem selection through publication. When integrity is taught and assessed at every stage, learners are more likely to understand that ethical conduct and methodological quality are mutually reinforcing. The result is research that is not only compliant but worthy of trust.

References

Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., & Scott, J. (2015). Beyond authorship: Attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. Learned Publishing, 28(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211

Emanuel, E. J., Wendler, D., & Grady, C. (2000). What makes clinical research ethical? JAMA, 283(20), 2701–2711. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.20.2701

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Fostering integrity in research. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/21896

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., et al. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. Scientific Data, 3, Article 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18

World Conferences on Research Integrity. (2010). Singapore statement on research integrity. https://wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement