Summary Post: **Ethical, Legal and Social Dimensions of Statistical Integrity – Reflections and Growth**

Engaging with Abi's ethical dilemma has deepened my understanding of how professional integrity, legal obligations, and societal responsibilities intersect in data analysis. My initial post focused on the dangers of data dredging, where selectively reporting favourable results can be as misleading as fabricating data, inflating false positives and undermining reproducibility (Simmons, Nelson and Simonsohn, 2011). I highlighted that transparent, reproducible practices, supported by professional codes such as those of the Association for Computing Machinery and the British Computer Society, are essential to maintain integrity (ACM, 2018; BCS, 2023). Additionally, legal frameworks such as the Food Safety Act 1990 and the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002) impose clear obligations to avoid misrepresentation and protect public health (Legislation.gov.uk, 1990; Eur-Lex, 2002).

The feedback from my peers provided valuable insights that broadened my perspective. Yousif emphasised the social impact of unethical reporting, particularly its disproportionate effects on vulnerable populations such as children. This reinforced the point that ethical dilemmas in data analysis are not purely technical or legal issues, but have real human consequences, as also highlighted by Ioannidis (2005), who argued that misleading research can erode public trust and harm health outcomes. Yousif further underscored the role of methodological safeguards—including pre-registration, sensitivity testing, and data/code sharing—as mechanisms not only for transparency but also for personal accountability (Crean, Gordijn and Kearns, 2025). These measures are consistent with the American Statistical Association's guidance on ethical statistical practice (American Statistical Association, 2018) and align with contemporary ethical principles of beneficence and non-maleficence in computing and AI (Floridi and Cowls, 2025).

Julius introduced a comparative legal dimension by referencing Germany's Hinweisgeberschutzgesetz, which implements EU whistleblower protections and shields employees from retaliation when reporting misconduct (IHK, 2023). This complemented my reference to the UK's Public Interest Disclosure Act (Gov.uk, 2024), helping me recognise the importance of understanding diverse regulatory frameworks when evaluating ethical dilemmas that may arise in international contexts.

Reflecting on this process, I have experienced growth in three key areas:

1. Expanded Ethical Awareness: I now more clearly understand the subtle forms of misconduct, such as selective reporting, and their potential harm to public trust and safety.

2. Integrated Legal Understanding: I have strengthened my ability to situate ethical decision-making within both national and international legal contexts, particularly regarding whistleblower protections.

3. Methodological Rigor as Ethical Imperative: I now view robust research design not merely as good practice, but as a moral obligation that supports accountability and defends against external pressure to compromise integrity.

In conclusion, this collaborative exercise has been immensely valuable. It transformed my view from a static, principle-based argument into a dynamic understanding of ethical practice. A data professional must not only know the rules but also understand the key conceptual, methodological, and legal tools to enforce them. This includes a nuanced awareness of the spectrum of misconduct, the implementation of robust, self-protecting methodologies, and the knowledge of an international framework of legal protections.

References

ACM (2018) *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Available at: https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics (Accessed: 8 September 2025).

American Statistical Association (2018) *Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice*. Available at: https://www.amstat.org/your-career/ethical-guidelines-for-statistical-practice (Accessed: 10 September 2025).

BCS (2023) *BCS Code of Conduct*. Available at: https://www.bcs.org/media/2211/bcs-code-of-conduct.pdf (Accessed: 10 September 2025).

Crean, D., Gordijn, B. and Kearns, A.J. (2025) 'Teaching research integrity as discussed in research integrity codes: A systematic literature review', *Accountability in Research*, 32(3), pp. 369–392. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2282153 (Accessed: 24 September 2025).

Eur-Lex (2002) *Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 — General Food Law*. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj (Accessed: 10 September 2025).

Floridi, L. and Cowls, J. (2025) 'Ethical Challenges in the Current Digital Landscape: AI, Robotics and Quantum Computing'. *Preprints.org*. Available at: https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202505.0507/v1 (Accessed: 10 September 2025).

Gov.uk (2024) *Information for whistleblowers / Public Interest Disclosure guidance*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/information-for-whistleblowers/information-for-whistleblowers (Accessed: 10 September 2025).

IHK (2023) *Whistleblowing: Das Hinweisgeberschutzgesetz ist da*. Available at: https://www.ihk.de/stuttgart/fuer-unternehmen/recht-und-steuern/arbeitsrecht/whistleblowing-5169770 (Accessed: 22 September 2025).

Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2005) 'Why most published research findings are false', *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124 (Accessed: 9 September 2025).

Legislation.gov.uk (1990) *Food Safety Act 1990*. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/16/contents (Accessed: 9 September 2025).

Simmons, J.P., Nelson, L.D. and Simonsohn, U. (2011) 'False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant', *Psychological Science*, 22(11), pp. 1359–1366. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632 (Accessed: 10 September 2025).