

Whizzz Cereal Case Study Takeaways

In reading several initial posts from my peers regarding Abi's dilemma, I identified a few key concerns about his potential decision regarding both ethical and legal implications.

Data integrity was one of the most common threads. All of the posts that I read agreed that both misrepresenting data is hugely unethical. Gareth and Thomas cited both the IEEE and ACM for textual condemnations of the practice, due to the importance of honesty and transparency (IEEE, 2020; ACM, 2018). Even without falsifying results, Abi is also obligated to disclose ALL data (both positive and negative) by both BCS and ACM guidelines as Mario and Aleksandr pointed out (BCS, 2022; ACM, 2018). This type of selective reporting is particularly harmful to the public - Thomas noted that the ACM specifically calls this out and Samuel even cited the British Psychological Society on this (ACM, 2018; BPS, 2014).

Another important consideration is that Abi holds some responsibility in any misuse of his final results. This means that even though Abi won't participate in the manufacturer's pursuant actions, his work would be complicit in whatever they decide should he decide to withhold the negative results. Samuel pointed out that this would make Abi legally liable under the UK Unfair Trading Regulations (UK Government, 2008). Mario and Aleksandr also pointed out that Abi could also face career repercussions should his reputation be marked by unethical behavior.

Across the board everyone agreed that upholding or raising the ethical bar should always be more important than any commercial interests. The Whizzz case study showed that despite the nuance found in the hypothetical dilemma, there are clear

reasons to make a decision that safeguards public safety as well as industry trust.

Personally I think that the Abi should simply publish the full report - whether the manufacturer should choose to use it or not, it's important for his own standards that he not compromise the results because of what he anticipates they might want.

References

Association for Computing Machinery (2018). *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. [online] Association for Computing Machinery. Available at: <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics>.

BCS (2022). *BCS Code of Conduct | BCS*. [online] www.bcs.org. Available at: <https://www.bcs.org/membership-and-registrations/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/>.

British Psychological Society. (2014) *Code of Human Research Ethics*. Leicester: BPS. Available from: <https://www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/bps-code-human-research-ethics>

IEEE (2020). *IEEE Code of Ethics | IEEE*. [online] ieee.org. Available at: <https://www.ieee.org/about/corporate/governance/p7-8>.

UK Government. (2008) *Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations*. Available from: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2008/1277/contents/made>