



CONTENT

News from WP I - Project Management and Coordination
Promoting Virtue or Punishing Fraud: Mapping Contrasts in the Language of ‘Scientific Integrity’ 5

News from WP II - What is Integrity? Multidisciplinary Reconnaissance
Team Tartu: Conference on Research Integrity on February 10, 2017 5

News from WP IV - Researcher’s Perspective

PRINTEGER Experience Requested: Contributing to the New Act on Research Ethics in Norway 6

News from WP VI – Dissemination & Communication

Expert Advice from a Local View: Second Local Stakeholder Panels Successfully Held

Workshop: Funding Opportunities in the Horizon2020 Program „Science with and for Society“, Bonn (Germany) 7

External Dissemination Activities

Research Integrity in Japan? Discussing the Role of Integrity in Research from a Global Perspective, Bristol (UK)

A Criminological Understanding of Deviance in Science: PRINTEGER at 16th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology 2016, Münster (Germany) 8



DEAR READER,

We are delighted to present this year’s first edition of the PRINTEGER Newsletter.

It’s project half-time and preparations for the upcoming survey for the researcher’s work floor perspective are in full swing! In the past six months, we asked local stakeholders for their advice on current progresses and exchanged opinions about research integrity with colleagues from Japan.

We also spoke to our European stakeholder panel member Carl Walter Matthias Kaiser about his thoughts on research integrity.

Find out more about these and further developments in this Newsletter edition.

We hope you will enjoy reading it!



Matthias Kaiser is Professor at the University of Bergen and Director of the Centre for the Study of Science and the Humanities (SVT) since March 2011. Before that, he was Director of the National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology (NENT) since 1991. During 1996-2002 he was Chair of ICSU's Standing Committee on Responsibility and Ethics in Science (SCRES). In the OECD working group on Facilitating Research Misconduct Investigations, he took part as the appointed Norwegian representative. His main work and areas of expertise are in the fields of philosophy of science, ethics of science, food ethics, and technology assessment. Matthias is also member of the PRINTEGER European Stakeholder Panel.

Matthias, what is your specific professional and personal interest in issues regarding research integrity and ethics in research? Can you tell us how you got interested in these issues?

These are two questions, let me answer the last one first: As a young student of philosophy of science, I was all occupied with the notion of scientific rationality. Then came the book „Betrayers“ of the Truth by W. Broad and N. Wade in 1984. That book conveyed the message that science was rotten from the inside, that we only saw the tip of the iceberg of fraud in science. In other words: not rationality, but greed and vanity! I was deeply shocked, made some investigations at my home university, and discovered soon there was at least a grain of truth to Broad and Wade's claim. This started my interest!

Now to my current professional, and admittedly to some extent also personal interest in the integrity and ethics of science: I am a great believer in science. I still marvel at many of its findings, and when it comes to the great misery, the great injustice, the horrible despair and total lack of hope that I have witnessed in the poor countries of the Global South, I believe science has an important part to play in improving this situation intellectually, technologically, economically and even culturally. Science can be a counter-move to corrupt politics. But this assumes science at its best, scientific contributions of high quality, of high relevance to the problems it addresses. Currently I see, however, a crisis in the sciences, a crisis of quality, of reproducibility, of trust, and of ethics. My interest in integrity issues and the ethics of science stems

from the desperate wish to be part of a scientific community where high quality of knowledge counts, and not where weak knowledge claims are treated as commodities on a market, and sold, nicely wrapped in golden political correctness, to gullible policy makers.

What role does research integrity play in your everyday working life as Professor and Director of the Centre for the Study of Science and the Humanities (SVT) at the University of Bergen?

In my everyday life? Well, I run around and teach it here and there, and give talks about it! I am also engaged in research about the issue, both in another H2020 project called ENERI, and also leading a national investigation (RINO) on scientific integrity in Norwegian research institutions. In recent years I noticed that the interest in these issues is rising dramatically. This has obviously to do with the suspicion that science develops signs of decay, that it becomes harder to fulfil the expectations with which science is met. In Norway, some teachings on the ethics (and theory) of science are mandated for all our PhD candidates by the Act on Higher Education. Our Centre is charged with doing this for the PhD candidates of all faculties. You see, ethics keeps us busy!



In your article “Ethics of Science and a New Social Contract for Knowledge” (2015), you pick up on the recurring claim that “science needs a new and re-negotiated social contract”. What is your opinion on that?

The great breakthrough of the scientific spirit (or rationality if you want) came with the Enlightenment, following up on the so-called Scientific Revolution (ca 1550-1750). The great breakthrough of science as an important institution in society, and driver of development came with the Industrial Revolution at the end of the 19th century. And after World War II, we have seen science develop into Big Science, managed like an industry towards given goals. Yet, our understanding of science and its relation to matters of society remains still on the level of the Enlightenment, the naïve framing of Modernity as some people like to say. But we see very different societal and environmental challenges in our days, and we see that Big Science is not always in tune with these challenges. One of the reasons for this is the old fashioned belief that facts and values are strictly separated in science, and that all ethical issues are external to the business of science, which according to this belief should be pure objectivity in knowledge claims. But nowadays we see that this belief is nonsense! Facts and values are intertwined in the sciences. Try to talk about risks, for instance, without invoking values and normative judgement! What we need is to recognize this and to couple our value-base in science to the value-base to which we as a democracy subscribe. Thus, a new social contract for science!

How does the concept of research integrity apply to food ethics and technology assessment and where do you see further overlaps?

Watch out, else you get me going for hours on end on this topic! But the simple starting point is that food is a highly complex topic in the middle of our physical, social, cultural and intellectual existence! It is virtually impossible to talk about food without evaluative judgements involved, and without dealing with our own personal bias based on tradition, taste and belief. And while we have seen throughout our cultural history a tremendous improvement in the quality of the food that we eat, we are also facing more complex choices

and trade-offs in our diet, some of them threatening our health and wellbeing, or creating damage to flora and fauna. In other words: a “gefundes Fressen” (German idiom, similar to “easy prey”) for scientific analysis and advice! However, due to the complexities and uncertainties involved, scientific advice in this area easily becomes heavily biased, sometimes influenced by powerful industries, and typically neglecting all uncertainties. Research integrity is not only about avoiding fraud in science, but it is about setting up high standards of quality. Food ethics is trying to do precisely this, and calls for truly holistic assessments in the food sector. So, food ethics is just one of the really important fields where good scientific integrity can make a difference and is called for.

You have been working in the field of ethics and integrity in research for more than two decades. What changes have you experienced throughout that time? What are current developments?

In the beginning it was „Sisyphos work“; all the powers were against you when you even raised the slightest doubt against science and scientists. Just the suspicion that all might not be well inside the house of science was nearly a reason for being thrown out! Arguments and surveys did not help. You were an enemy of the People (in Ibsen’s terms) if you raised doubt about the integrity of science. This changed with the occurrence of the big fraud scandals in science. In Norway, it was the Jon Sudbø case, in other countries other cases. Now nobody could claim that the self-policing of science was effective against major breaches of ethics. And with Big Science growing, the temptations to cut corners also seems to grow. That is why ethics and integrity of science is high on the political agenda now. If one cannot rely on the published results of science any more, and if it becomes virtually impossible to differentiate between background noise and information, then all investments in research seem futile, seem to end up in a void. There is a spreading sense of crisis in science, and parallel to it a desperate hope directed towards ethics and integrity of science to remedy this, to come up with a quick fix! The problem I see now is that there is no quick fix. If we want to change this, a change of the scientific culture, and of the commodification of knowledge



is needed. But this will take quite some time I am afraid.

What kind of contribution can the science community make to promote integrity? And what would you like politicians to do in order to promote integrity as an integral dimension of excellence in research?

My plea is usually for a change to slow science: do as we do with the food, i.e. slow food needs our caring attention but delivers a better quality! Take more time for the quality checks in science before we offer our findings to the general public. As I said earlier, we need nothing less than a cultural change. This we only get when we first learn to talk openly and with each other about our problems and challenges. And second, we need to educate the next generations explicitly in the moral framework, which we believe befits the noble business of understanding the world. Politicians? I would like to see that they engage more in an effort to gain scientific literacy, and I would like them to recognize their own fallibility (as science does), and publicly acknowledge when they are wrong. While I recognize that many scientists do not take politicians' worries and difficult tasks serious enough, I also see politicians who put power and personal vanity above respect for knowledge and wisdom. When I hear about high level politicians who aspire to the highest offices, but have doctoral titles based on plagiarized work, then I know that not only the scientific community is in a state of crisis.

What do you expect from a project like PRINTEGER to contribute to the promotion of a research culture in which integrity is a crucial factor?

PRINTEGER comes at the right time, and it is essentially European. I hope it will cooperate with many other activities and projects which also work now for the promotion of integrity in science. I hope its outcome will not drown in technicalities and sophisticated reasonings. My hope is for a single and powerful message to the scientific community, framed in easy to understand language, which communicates well in all corners of Europe. Address the practitioners first, before you worry

about the regulators! Put ethics on the pedestal and let the law only support the work when really needed. Let the scientific knowledge flourish, but condemn the “marketplace of the Idols” (F. Bacon), the vanity fair of personal ambitions, and the perversion of knowledge and intellectual mastery to a good like any other good on the market. Speak up for the quality of science!

Is there any good book or article you would like to recommend to our readers?

I am obviously biased in my recommendation, but I think a book with major contributions from people who work at my Centre for the Study of the Sciences and Humanities at the University of Bergen is a good recommendation here. It is arguing that science is indeed facing a difficult crisis of quality these days. And it costs less than 10 USD! Here is the reference:

Benessia, A., Funtowicz, S., Giampietro, M., Guimarães Pereira, A., Ravetz, J., Saltelli, A., Strand, R. & van der Sluijs, J. (2016). Science on the Verge. Tempe, AZ: The Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at Arizona State University.

Thank you for taking part in our interview, Matthias!



PRINTEGER RESULTS

NEWS FROM WP I - PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

Promoting Virtue or Punishing Fraud: Mapping Contrasts in the Language of ‘Scientific Integrity’

New Year – New Publication. Members from the PRINTEGER project coordination team recently published a paper on contrasts in the language of scientific integrity. “Even though integrity is widely considered to be an essential aspect of research, there is an ongoing debate on what actually constitutes research integrity. The understanding of integrity ranges from the minimal, only considering falsification, fabrication and plagiarism, to the maximum, blending into science ethics. Underneath these obvious contrasts, there are more subtle differences that are not as

immediately evident. The debate about integrity is usually presented as a single, universal discussion, with shared concerns for researchers, policymakers and “the public”, the abstract summarizes. In their article, they show that there is more to this point. You want to know why? The paper is online available here: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11948-016-9858-y>

NEWS FROM WP II - WHAT IS INTEGRITY? MULTIDISCIPLINARY RECONNAISSANCE

Team Tartu: Conference on Research Integrity on February 10, 2017



Prof Margit Sutrop, Head of the Centre for Ethics, University of Tartu and PRINTEGER partner during her presentation “Why do we need Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity?”

The Centre for Ethics (Tartu University) together with the Estonian Research Council organized a conference on “Researching with Integrity” on February 10, 2017. The conference was dedicated to defining misconduct and questionable practices in Estonia, Europe and worldwide. In line with the PRINTEGER project, the conference followed leading questions on how to promote research integrity and how to define misconduct, questionable practices and good research. PRINTEGER partner Eric Breit (Oslo and Akershus

University College of Applied Sciences) from Oslo gave insights into working with research integrity in organizations.

Furthermore, Dr. Isidoros Karatzas (Head of the Ethics and Research Integrity Sector, European Commission, DG Research & Innovation) explained in his keynote why excellent research comes along with research integrity.

With a special focus on the first draft of the Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity initiated by the Estonian Research Council, interactive workshops and a panel discussion offered researchers the opportunity to share their opinion on the current process. It was discussed why Estonia needs to formulate its own good practice of research and how different rules and organizational culture influence researchers’ ethical conduct.

To see all presentations, please visit: <http://www.eetika.ee/et/konverents-aus-teadus-motestades-head-teadustava-international-conference-researching-integrity>



PRINTEGER Experience Requested: Contributing to the New Act on Research Ethics in Norway

Our partners from Oslo were involved in the new Act on Research Ethics when the Norwegian Parliamentary Committee for Research was preparing it for a parliamentary vote. Considering the extensive experience in the field of research integrity, the Committee welcomed their advice in the new act.

The new law, proposed by the Ministry, requi-

red a consideration of the legal background and motivations, where PRINTEGER functioned as a good source. As a result, the PRINTEGER Oslo team, amongst other relevant organizations, was invited for a semi-open hearing to present their view on the new law. "We used this opportunity to commend the ministry as the new law is a significant improvement in several regards. However, we also pointed out that the law did not suffi-



From left to right: PRINTEGER team members Dr. Sverre-Erik Mamelund, Dr. Ellen-Marie Forsberg and Knut Jørgen Vie from Oslo and Akershus University College.

ciently take into account the different pressures that researchers are exposed to, and the risk that such pressures can lead to misconduct", Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo and Akershus University College) explains. Taking into account that the law was light on measures directed towards the individual researcher, the team further proposed that it should include an amendment requiring from research institutions to build an ethical culture that promotes good conduct. Though the governing parties did not vote for the proposal in the end, the PRINTEGER team achieved a satisfying result: "The politicians in the committee discussed our perspectives and most of them recognized

our concerns. This was our goal, to give politicians a better understanding of the mechanisms involved in misconduct. Now they will hopefully be in a better position to govern the research sector responsibly" Mr. Vie concludes.

The consultation is also available online. Watch the video here (in Norwegian): <http://bit.ly/2mm-1VIN>

Expert Advice from a Local View: Second Local Stakeholder Panels Successfully Held

The Second Local Stakeholder Panels were held between November 2016 and February 2017. The local panels, mostly consisting of 5-10 local experts with various backgrounds in academia, industry and research, aimed at presenting current results and developments in the project.

Amongst the panels, special attention was paid to the upcoming survey in work package IV “How do Researchers Experience Integrity? Understanding Integrity from a Work Floor Perspective”. Possible obstacles and solutions were discussed.



© Sarah Gansen / University of Bonn

Workshop: Funding Opportunities in the Horizon2020 Program „Science with and for Society“, Bonn (Germany)

During the event “Funding Opportunities in the Horizon2020 Program ,Science with and for Society“ on November 3, 2016 in Bonn, PRINTEGER was presented as a best practice example for successful project proposals. The event started with an overview on funding opportunities, followed by a detailed explanation on the application process for the program.

The International Office of the University of Bonn organized this event in cooperation with the National Contact Point „Science with and for Society“, EU Office of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research Germany. It was funded by the Ministry of Innovation, Science and Research of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia.

EXTERNAL DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Research Integrity in Japan? Discussing the Role of Integrity in Research from a Global Perspective, Bristol (UK)

PRINTEGER went global during a workshop on research integrity in Bristol (UK) on September 19, 2016. Together with a group of researchers from the University of Kyoto (Japan), experts from the University of Bristol and members from the PRINTEGER project team, exchanged their experiences on integrity in research.

During the morning session, Tetsuji Iseda, Associate Professor of the Department of Ethics, Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University, reflected research integrity philosophically in the global context. Picking up on this approach, Tatsuya Ito analyzed misconduct in medical research in Japan. Supportive guidance is a main focus of Birgit Whiteman's work as the Head of Research Governance at the University of Bristol. She demonstrated on how the university is encouraging a positive cul-



ture of research integrity in her presentation. Members from the PRINTEGER team took the chance for feedback by presenting results from the normative analysis, case studies and the upcoming survey on researchers' perspective to the Japanese delegation.

A Criminological Understanding of Deviance in Science: PRINTEGER at 16th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology 2016, Münster (Germany)

PRINTEGER project partners from Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Department of Criminology, presented the project during the 16th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology in Muenster, Germany on September 22, 2016. In their presentation, they argued that an "understanding of the expanding ethical mindset in science as a response to the problematization of incorrect behaviors can offer interesting insights from a criminological perspective". The partners drew parallels with the rise of the integrity concept in other

professional contexts such as police departments and the private security sector, resulting in a wide range of institutional measures, codes of conduct and prevention strategies. The presentation was based on the literature analysis within the PRINTEGER project. The findings within the literature study point to the added value that a criminological perspective, hitherto lacking, can offer scientific misconduct.

UPCOMING EVENTS

> 28 - 31 May 2017

5th World Conference on Research Integrity, Amsterdam (The Netherlands)

<http://www.wcri2017.org>

> 06-07 February 2018

PRINTEGER Final Conference, Bonn (Germany)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Horbach, S., Halffman, W. (2016). Promoting Virtue or Punishing Fraud: Mapping Contrasts in the Language of 'Scientific Integrity'. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, doi:doi:10.1007/s11948-016-9858-y.



PARTNERS

Radboud University



IMPRINT

Published by: PRINTEGER Consortium

The publishers do not assume liability with respect to the accuracy and completeness of the information provided.

Editorial: Mira Zöller, University of Bonn (UBO)

CONTACT

E-Mail: mzoeller@uni-bonn.de
printeger@uni-bonn.de

FOLLOW US



@PRINTEGER



www.facebook.com/printeger



<http://printeger.eu>

If you wish to unsubscribe, please click here: <http://printeger.eu/news/newsletter-unsubscribe/>



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 665926.

