



In this issue:

1. Interview with Dr Maura Hiney

2. PRINTEGER Results

2.1 News from WP I

General Assembly in Oslo, Norway

2.2 News from WP II

WP II - Finalised

2.3 News from WP III

In-depth misconduct case studies

2.4 News from WP IV

WP IV - Started

2.5 News from WP VI

Second Local Stakeholder Panels

3. External Dissemination Activities

Europe Round the Corner Open Days

Research Integrity Network Conference

4. UPCOMING EVENTS

5. RECENT PUBLICATIONS



© Mira Zöller, University of Bonn

PRINTEGER Team and Policy Advisory Board Members at the General Assembly in Oslo.

DEAR READER,

We are delighted to present the second edition of the PRINTEGER Newsletter.

In this newsletter, we offer a brief overview on the progress of PRINTEGER since the last edition in March 2016. The second year of the project has just started: first results have been achieved and new developments are taking place.

With this edition we inform you about finalised and upcoming project developments and events. Furthermore, PRINTEGER policy advisory board member Dr Maura Hiney from the Health Research Board Ireland shared her thoughts about research integrity with us.

We hope you will enjoy reading this issue!

# 1. INTERVIEW

## INTERVIEW WITH PRINTEGER POLICY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER DR MAURA HINEY



© Dr Maura Hiney

**D**r Maura Hiney is a qualified nurse (1982) and holds a BSc (Hons) in Microbiology and Biochemistry (1988) as well as a PhD (1994) in Molecular Diagnostics. She worked as a researcher and as director of research support services in the university sector. Currently she is Head of Post-Award and Evaluation at the Health Research Board, Ireland.

Maura chairs the Science Europe Working Group on Research Integrity and is member of the ALLEA Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics, where she leads the subgroup dedicated to updating the “European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity”.

In 2015, she acted as expert advisor on research integrity to the Luxembourg Ministry for Research and Education during the Luxembourg Presidency of the EU.

Within PRINTEGER, she is supporting the project as a member of the policy advisory board.

**Dr Hiney, you have a particular interest in issues pertaining to research integrity and ethics in research. Can you tell us how you got interested in these issues? How did your qualification bring you to the field of research integrity and ethics?**

I have been interested in ethics and research integrity since my PhD studies. I was very lucky to have a supervisor who set high standards of behaviour. However, I also observed a number of instances of fabrication and falsification of experimental results, at a time where there was little guidance on what constituted good research practices and no encouragement, support or institutional structures for researchers, especially junior researchers, to bring forward ethical concerns. When I moved to the Health Research Board in 2007 these issues really came into focus for me since, unfortunately, many of the high-profile misconduct cases have been in the fields of psychology and medicine.

**What role do research integrity and ethics play in your day to day job at the Health Research Board Ireland?**

As a publically-funded agency we are very conscious that public and political support for research is not unlimited. So we take seriously our responsibility to ensure the quality and integrity of our research outputs and that our investment is not

wasted on ill-conceived, poorly designed or executed, or downright fraudulent research. Nationally, we have taken a lead role in awareness-raising among Irish researchers and politicians on the importance of having robust policies and procedures to protect both research work and the researchers who perform it.

**You are the author of a briefing paper entitled “Research Integrity: What it Means, Why it Is Important and How we Might Protect it” (December 2015) for Science Europe, and the editor of a Survey Report “Research Integrity Practices in Science Europe Member Organisations” (July 2016). What are the main findings and conclusions of these publications? Did you get any feedback on them so far?**

Delving into the available evidence on all aspects of research integrity really demonstrated for me the complexity of this issue and the multiple actors who need to work individually and collaboratively to advance it. The feedback on this paper was very positive, and helped my work with the Luxembourg Presidency greatly, when they were compiling the Competitiveness Council Conclusions on Research Integrity, published in December 2015.



The Survey Report found that there is still some fragmentation across Science Europe member organisations in their policies.

This is not really surprising, given the diversity of membership of Science Europe and the differing legal and regulatory requirements they face. The recommendations in the survey report are for the most part quite easily implemented by funding agencies and research performers.

**As a member of the ALLEA Permanent Working Group on Science & Ethics and chairperson of a formed subgroup, you are currently working on a revision of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Why is this revision necessary?**

The development of the European Code of Conduct (March 2011) was an important step in creating a framework that could be used by a wide range of actors involved in the research endeavour. However, a lot has changed in the research landscape since the first publication, such as technological advances, growing concern about reproducibility, and challenges arising from collaboration and the Open Science agenda. The Commission also wants a revised Code as the standard reference document for EU-funded research projects. This is a great opportunity to ensure the continuing relevance of the Code in framing the conditions for science and scholarship in Europe.

**Relevant stakeholders and experts outside academia will be involved in the revision of the European Code of Conduct through a two-stage consultation process. Can you describe this process a little more?**

Yes, the consultation will take place in two phases – an initial scoping consultation of the issues that stakeholders see as missing or inadequate in the current Code, and a second consultation seeking a much more detailed feedback from stakeholders on a draft revised document. Stakeholder consultation will take place through representative bodies. The first phase has already been initiated, with a deadline for responses by mid-August. The second phase of stakeholder consultation will be an invitation to submit detailed feedback on the first draft of the revised Code. The revised Code will be finalised by the end of January, with

an intended publication date in February 2017.

**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?**

A lot of the focus has been on developing policies and processes to police the academic community. However, individuals are still accountable for their own actions, so bottom up action is critical. Leaving aside practices that damage the research record, which no researcher would condone, we should be more concerned about questionable research practices. Deliberate or not, questionable research practice is all too common and it is here that the research community can have its greatest impact. The good news is that prevention of such practices is very amenable to training and good mentoring, which should start the moment the fledgling researcher enters a research environment, so the responsibility and influence of more experienced researchers is huge. Of course poor individual behaviors are often a response to performance-related pressures within the structures of today's academic world, which is where institutions and politicians should be involved.

**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?**

Since misconduct refers to people's behaviours and actions and the principles by which they live their lives, if we want to decrease or prevent research misconduct, we need to understand the drivers of those behaviours. The challenge is how to make research integrity part of the research culture. I think that the outputs from the PRINTEGER project will be crucial here.

**If you could change one thing in the European research ecosystem, what would that be?**

I believe that one of the biggest things we can do is to develop really high quality training on research integrity across Europe. I would love to see training move to something much more substantial than is currently the case, so that it is embedded with methodological considerations, ethics and so on.



## Final question: do you have a suggestion for a good book/article for our readers?

I'm interested in what drives people to commit misconduct or to accept poor practices in their work and how we might address these behaviors through environmental interventions. Three books that I've found really interesting in this regards are:

*"Blind Spots: Why we fail to do what's right and what to do about it"* by Max H. Bazerman and Ann E. Tenbrunsel (Princeton University Press, 2011).

*"Intuition"* by Allegra Goodman (Atlantic Books, 2009).

*"Cultivating Conscience: How good laws make good practice"* by Lynn Stout (Princeton University Press, 2011).

**Thank you for taking part in our interview, Maura!**

Note: This is a shortened version of the full interview to be found online:

<http://printeger.eu/news/interview-with-printeger-policy-advisory-board-member-dr-maura-hiney/>

The interview was conducted by Mira Zöller, University of Bonn (WP VI).

## 2. PRINTEGER RESULTS

### 2.1 News from WP I - Project Management and Coordination

#### PRINTEGER Second General Assembly in Oslo, 25-26 August 2016

The PRINTEGER consortium and further experts met for the Second General Assembly (GA) in Oslo (Norway) from 25 - 26 August 2016. The GA acts as the ultimate decision-making body of the consortium. During the meeting, sessions devoted to specific work packages (II, III, IV and VI) were held. On day one, partners from the University of Tartu (Estonia) presented results of conceptual exploration within WP II "What is Integrity? Multidisciplinary Reconnaissance". The consortium continued then with work package III "What Happens in Practice?

Institutional Responses to Misconduct", lead by the Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS) and Research Group Crime and Society (CRiS) of Vrije Universiteit Brussels. Day two was opened with the University of Bonn (UBO) presenting finalised dissemination activities, next steps and upcoming events (WP VI). To clarify motivations and drivers as well as complexities of integrity from the perspective of the scientific work-floor, the Oslo and Akershus University College (HiOA) is to conduct a survey with researchers and key informants in the research system (WP IV). The consortium and experts discussed further proceedings for the survey. The meeting was closed with the General Assembly including feedback and advice from the present experts. Teambuilding and exchange of experiences were further important parts of the GA.

For pictures visit : <http://printeger.eu/events/photos-general-assembly-oslo-25-26-august-2016/>

Task leader: Radboud University Nijmegen (RU)



Discussing normative categories of misconduct with expert Prof. Dr Lex M. Bouter.

## 2.2 News from WP II - Reconnaissance

### WP II - Finalised: Multidisciplinary Reconnaissance on Integrity

Within the first year of the PRINTEGER project, our partners from the University of Tartu (CEUT, Estonia) concluded their analytic reconnaissance of integrity and research misconduct. The work package aimed to explore important developments and policy regime guidelines, ethical codes and policy instruments. In consultation with stakeholders, it provides improved scoping and articulation of the project objectives, contributing to innovative and more effective approaches.

Task leader: University of Tartu (CEUT)

## 2.3 News from WP III - What Happens in Practice? Institutional Responses to Misconduct

### Inventory: in-depth misconduct case studies

Leiden University's Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) contribution for PRINTEGER focuses on the extent and incidence of misconduct. The research concentrates partly on in-depth case studies that reflect both daily dilemmas and broader issues which the scientific community faces.

CWTS has identified two cases. The first case relates to the phenomenon of retractions. Building upon previous work at CWTS, which has been reported at various conferences (STI-Conference in Leiden in 2014 and 4S-Conference in Denver 2015), the team now wants to expand the data collection in a more structural and sustainable way by focussing on retrieving the notifications from the retracted journal publications in the Web of Science. The information to be collected relates to the reason for retraction, as well as to the party

responsible for the retraction. Previous work has shown that the reasons are rather diffuse (ranging from honest error to plain fraud), while the parties responsible for the retraction notifications stand in a complicated relation to these reasons for retraction.

The second case relates to the appearance of so-called predatory journals. These journals started to appear on the academic landscape with the increasing importance of publishing in open access mode. Open access is that way of publishing whereby not the subscription paid by the readers gives access to scientific knowledge, but the producers pay for making their findings public. Through this method of publishing, scientific knowledge could be made more publicly available than at present. The journals that are labelled as 'predatory journals' do seem to have rather high Article Publishing Costs (APCs), without offering the facilities which established journals offer to publishing authors, such as peer review. From the outside this is difficult to assess by an author, particularly when the authors are not yet experienced in publishing research findings. Work on this case is currently in the start-up phase.

Task leader: Radboud University Nijmegen (RU)

## 2.4 News from WP IV - Researcher's Perspective

### WPIV - Started: Survey on Researchers Experience

How do Researchers Experience Integrity? Understanding Integrity from a Work-Floor Perspective

The work in WP IV shifts attention from a systematic review (WP II) to the work-floor to map out how scientists perceive, experience and address integrity issues. Information is gathered through a web-based e-survey and in-depth focus groups. The work-floor perspective will analyse which integrity issues researchers experience most intensely, which integrity promoting measures they find most helpful, and how they deal with the demands of changing and competitive research environments. Hence this work package, centred in the second year of the project, aims to understand integrity through social science methods.

Task leader: Oslo and Akershus University College (HiOA)

## 2.5 News from WP VI - Dissemination & Communication

### Second Local Stakeholder Panels to be held in October/November 2016

As a part of the dissemination and communication work package, small advisory stakeholder panels are set up by the partners three times during the project period.

The first scoping meetings were held between September 2015 and February 2016. The second round is taking place between October and November 2016 where first project results and upcoming tasks will be discussed in local panels. The local panels held by every partner aim to assure that the project's strong work-floor focus is maintained throughout the project and will provide a voice in priorities and demarcations of the project for the work-floor.

Task leader: University of Bonn (UBO)

## 3. EXTERNAL DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

### Presentations

13 MAY, 2016 - FASCINATING 'EUROPE ROUND THE CORNER' OPEN DAYS

On 13 May 2016, Radboud University Nijmegen was one of the locations of the 'Europe Round the Corner' Open Day. As a main goal, the event aimed at showing people the tangible results of EU policy through projects in their local areas. During the open days, Dutch public bodies, businesses and knowledge institutions showcased their involvement and collaboration in and with the EU. Within this frame, PRINTEGER project coordinator Prof. Dr Hub Zwart (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen) and project partner Serge

Horbach (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen) presented the project to local residents, friends and partners, business associates, colleagues and students. Approximately 150 people came to the Huygens building to see projects normally not accessible to the general public. Further popular spots at Radboud University Nijmegen were the Observatory, the High Field Magnet Laboratory, the Felix Laser Lab, the greenhouse complex with its experimental ditches and a mobile planetarium. The event was organised by managing authorities of the four regional programmes of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF):



Prof. Dr Hub Zwart presenting on Europe Round the Corner Open Days.  
© Ruud van Oijjen, Radboud University Nijmegen

the municipality of Rotterdam, the province of Gelderland, the Northern Netherlands Provinces alliance (SNN) and Stimulus, together with the Ministry of Economic Affairs. The campaign won the European Public Communication Award last year. Other EU member states have now adopted the open days concept.

**25 MAY, 2016 - FOSTERING RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH IN PRACTICE: PRINTEGER AT RESEARCH INTEGRITY NETWORK CONFERENCE 2016**

The PRINTEGER project was part of several presentations at the Netherlands Research Integrity Network Conference 2016 in Amsterdam on 25 May 2016. The conference aimed at fostering

responsible research practices.

Prof. Dr Hub Zwart (Radboud University Nijmegen) discussed integrity challenges in Ian McEwan's *Solar* – on the use of novels in research and education concerning research integrity in the era of big science. In a session on the research integrity concept, PRINTEGER partner Marijke van Bugenhout and Prof. Dr Jenneke Christiaens (Vrije University Brussels) developed a criminological understanding of deviance in science.

They argued in their presentation that a criminological understanding of deviance in science is necessary in order to explore the ecology of today's scientific practice as a knowledge economy, and the elements that are catalyst for misconduct.

Please visit the website for further information and presentations:  
<http://printeger.eu/documents-results/>

<https://www.nrin.nl/research-conference-2016/program>

## 4. UPCOMING EVENTS

### PRINTEGER events

> OCT/NOV 2016: Second Local Stakeholder Panels, all PRINTEGER partners

Further information: <http://printeger.eu/events/>

### Related events

> 03 NOVEMBER 2016: Funding Opportunities in the Horizon2020 Programme „Science with and for Society“, Bonn (Germany)

> 28 - 31 MAY 2017: 5th World Conference on Research Integrity, Amsterdam (The Netherlands)  
<http://www.wcri2017.org>

## 5. RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Boehme, Olivier / Föger, Nicole / Hiney, Maura / Peatfield, Tony / Petiet, Francien (2016): Research Integrity Practices in Science Europe Member Organisations. Survey Report, Science Europe.

González Fuster, G.: Un-mapping Personal Data Transfers. European Data Protection Law Review. Volume 2, Issue 2 (2016), pp. 160 - 168.

Zwart, Hub: The obliteration of life: depersonalization and disembodiment in the terabyte era. New Genetics and Society. Volume 35, Issue 1 (2016), pp. 69 - 89.

Hiney, Maura (2015): Research Integrity: What it Means, Why it Is Important and How we Might Protect it. Briefing Paper, Science Europe.

### Upcoming (2017)

De Rijcke, Sarah / Stockelova, Tereza (2017): Feeding off and feeding up the dominant: Predatory publishing and the imperative of international productivity. In: Biagioli, Mario / Lippmann, Alexandra: Gaming Metrics. Innovation & Surveillance in Academic Misconduct. MIT Press Infrastructures Series.

# 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](mailto:mzoeller@uni-bonn.de)  
[printeger@uni-bonn.de](mailto:printeger@uni-bonn.de)

## FOLLOW US



@PRINTEGER



[www.facebook.com/printeger](http://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.

