

Initial Post

◀ Initial Post

Summary Post ▶

Display replies in nested form

Settings ▾



Initial Post

by [Fahad Abdallah](#) - Monday, 16 June 2025, 9:12 PM

Abi's ethical dilemma concerns data integrity, statistical responsibility, and professional conduct. While he does not alter the raw data, emphasizing only favourable analyses, despite contradictory findings, constitutes ethical manipulation. The British Psychological Society's Code of Human Research Ethics (2021) asserts that researchers must present data truthfully and without bias, ensuring no harm arises from their interpretations. The idea that "statistics can support either side" is a dangerous oversimplification. Selective reporting risks misleading stakeholders, especially in matters involving public health. Ferrara (2024) explains that ethical reasoning requires consideration of outcomes, analysis transparency, and avoiding manipulation, even when data remains technically unchanged. Therefore, Abi is ethically obliged to disclose *positive and negative findings*, contextualised within sound methodological explanations.

Abi cannot ignore the foreseeable misuse of his results. The World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki (2025) insists that researchers must safeguard participants and the public by ensuring full, honest disclosure of findings. Suppose Abi suspects the manufacturer will publicise only the positive data. In that case, he should take proactive steps, such as including a disclaimer in the report or negotiating terms that require publishing the complete analysis. From a legal perspective, misleading claims based on biased data may breach consumer protection laws. Ghapa and Ab Kadir (2021) note that advertisements and information spread through business must be true to oneself. The authors emphasise regulatory efforts. Abi might be directly involved in promoting lies, which might affect his workplace position.

Socially, selective disclosure of health information can lead to a lack of trust among individuals regarding scientific research. Abi ought to think about internal escalation or, in case of necessity, whistleblowing, which amounts to public interest disclosure in numerous jurisdictions. Finally, as an ethical person, Abi is not just a matter of computation. Maintenance of transparency, protection of societal interest, and refusal of influence by business organisations are key factors of ethics in computing and research activities.

References

ACM. (2018). *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Available at: <https://ethics.acm.org> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

British Psychological Society. (2021). *BPS Code of Human Research Ethics*. Available at: <https://www.bps.org.uk/guideline/bps-code-human-research-ethics> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Ferrara, L. (2024). Ethical Principles. In *Ethical Reasoning in Forensic Science* (Vol. 41). Springer. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-58392-6_2 (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Ghapa, N., & Ab Kadir, N. A. (2021). Information Regulation: A Measure of Consumer Protection. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 29(S2), 59–74. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.S2.05> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

World Medical Association. (2025). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants. *JAMA*, 333(1), 71–74. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2024.21972> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Maximum rating: -

[Permalink](#) [Reply](#)



Re: Initial Post

by [Kingsley Onyeemeosi](#) - Wednesday, 18 June 2025, 9:18 PM

Peer review

Thanks for sharing such insightful thoughts. Your analysis effectively underscores Abi's ethical obligations, e

[Chat to us!](#)