

Definition of Research Misconduct: Problem on “Definition” or “User”?

Somsri Wiwanitkit · Viroj Wiwanitkit

Received: 13 September 2013 / Accepted: 16 September 2013 / Published online: 25 September 2013
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Sir,

The case discussion by Rasmussen is very interesting (Rasmussen 2013). Rasmussen concluded that “argue that the precedent set by the reasoning in this case is problematic.” In fact, the final decision whether an accused case of misconduct is exactly guilty or not is very complicated. The decision has to follow the standard definition of misconduct. However, there are usually problems in decision. The question is whether the standard is problematic or the “user” or the ones who interpret and make decision is problematic. There are many factors that can affect the final decision. First, the bias to decide “not guilty” is common. This might be a “false negative”. Sometimes, the accused person is a senior academic person or administrator, the bias can be seen (Joob and Wiwanitkit 2012). This is the rooted problem in many developing countries where the academic society is under standard (Joob and Wiwanitkit 2012). Second, the opposite bias can also be expected. This might be the case that the judgment is by the “enemy” of the accused person. In some cases, there are many accused persons but the final decision on guilty might be on the least senior person in team. Therefore, the concern is how to find the “justice” and “jury” who have no conflict of interest is the problem for further discussion.

References

- Joob, B., & Wiwanitkit, V. (2012). Plagiarism among faculty applicants. *Am J Pharm Educ*, 76(3), 54.
Rasmussen, L. M. (2013). The case of vipul bhrigu and the federal definition of research misconduct. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2013 Sep 4. [Epub ahead of print].

S. Wiwanitkit (✉)

Wiwanitkit House, Bangkhuae, Bangkok 10160, Thailand
e-mail: somsriviwan@hotmail.com

V. Wiwanitkit

Joseph Ayobabalola University, Ikeji-Arakeji, Nigeria