



## Promoting Integrity as an Integral Dimension of Excellence in Research

\*\*\*

### Report and proceedings of the European Conference on Research Integrity

#### DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

<b>Deliverable Number</b>	D 6.4
<b>Work Package</b>	WP6
<b>Task</b>	T 6.4
<b>Type</b>	Report
<b>Version</b>	1.3
<b>Number of Pages</b>	36
<b>Due Date of Deliverable</b>	Month 32, 30/04/2018
<b>Actual Submission Date</b>	Month 32, 30/04/2018
<b>Dissemination Level</b>	Public
<b>Authors</b>	Mira Zöller, University of Bonn



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

## Content

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Structure and Reach-out of the Conference .....	3
3.	Structure of the Conference.....	3
4.	Dissemination Activities to Promote the PRINTEGER European Conference .....	7
5.	- Day 1, February 5, 2018 - .....	11
5.1.	Welcome Address – Dr. Willem Halffman.....	11
5.2.	Session on Good Science I - Chair: Prof. Ruud ter Meulen.....	11
5.3.	Session on International Perspectives I – Chair: Dr. Eric Breit .....	12
5.4.	Session on Misconduct I- Chair: Prof. Dr. Massimiano Bucchi .....	14
5.5.	Session on Integrity Education - Chair: Andrea Reyes Elizondo (Leiden University).....	15
5.6.	Session on Good Science II – Chair: Dr. Eric Breit.....	16
5.7.	Session on International Perspectives II – Chair: Prof. Dr. Gloria Gonzales Fuster.....	18
5.8.	Session on Integrity Narratives – Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli .....	19
5.9.	Session on Integrity Practices – Chair: Prof. Dr. Serge Gutwirth.....	21
6.	- Day 2, February 6, 2018 - .....	23
6.1.	Keynote Speech: Fostering a Culture of Research Integrity: The Contribution of Policy as an Agent of Change .....	23
6.2.	Session on Good Science III – Chair: Dr. Willem Halffman .....	24
6.3.	Session on Fraud – Chair: Dr. Svenn-Erik Mamelund .....	25
6.4.	Session on Questionable Research Practices - Chair: Prof. Dr. Jenneke Christiaens .....	26
6.5.	Session on Research Misconduct – Chair: Dr. Thed van Leeuwen .....	28
6.6.	Session on Journals – Chair: Dr. Sarah de Rijcke .....	30
6.7.	Session on Strengthening Integrity – Chair: Dr. Willem Halffman .....	31
6.8.	Session on Responsible Research - Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli .....	33
6.9.	Panel Discussion: “The Next Steps: Joining Forces to Implement our Results and Promote a Supportive European Research Integrity Culture” .....	34
7.	- Day 3, February 7, 2018 - .....	35
7.1.	Consensus Conference: Working with Research Integrity –Guidance for Research Performing Organisations: The Bonn PRINTEGER Statement .....	35
7.2.	UPRIGHT – Try-out of Tools with Students .....	36



## 1. Introduction

In order to maximise the coordinating effect of this project, but also to give the issue of integrity a high-visibility event, a major conference was organised in February 2018. The conference entitled “European Conference on Research Integrity – Why Research Integrity Matters to You!” involved all the major stakeholders and forums in research integrity, including members of national research ethics boards, international scientific fora, national and EU policy makers, scientific publishers, politicians, prominent scientists and journalists. The conference was the main occasion for professionals involved in research integrity to meet in Europe. It also functioned as a forum for researchers in this project to present results.

Rather than a standard conference, the event was the major occasion for discussing and disseminating preliminary project results.

The conference was organised in Bonn, Germany and clearly advertised as an initiative supported by the European Union.

The aim of the conference was to explore research integrity from multiple perspectives, to uncover entanglements and tensions in research practices, exchange views, and discuss project results. We invited early stage researchers, senior researchers, students, research managers, industrial researchers, academic teachers, journal editors and research policy makers but also the media and the broader public to participate and enrich discussions.

The conference was planned back-to-back with a project partner meeting. Part of this conference was the consensus conference and the try-out of tools with students.

## 2. Structure and Reach-out of the Conference

The PRINTEGER European Conference on Research Integrity – Why Research Integrity Matters to You was designed as a three days conference from February 5 to February 7, 2018. It took place in the premises of the main building of the University of Bonn (UBO). The city of Bonn and especially UBO is a highly representative for international conferences due to its high standards of infrastructure and available spaces.

## 3. Structure of the Conference

On day 1, PRINTEGER project coordinator Willem Halfman opened the conference with a Welcome Address to the audience. On day 2 and day 3, opening themes were addressed by keynote speakers Dr. Maura Hiney, Health Research Board, Ireland & Chair of Science Europe Working Group on Research Integrity and Gareth O’Neill, President of the European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers. Keynotes were followed by in-depth discussions in smaller parallel sessions, giving participants the chance to choose a special research integrity topic according to their interests



As the main part of the conference days were structured in three to four parallel sessions, a call for paper was opened in July 2017:

### Present your Research

This conference is a unique chance to present your special research focus on research integrity and discuss it with a multi-disciplinary group of early stage researchers, senior researchers, students, research managers, industrial researchers, academic teachers, journal editors and research policy makers but also the media and the broader public.

Highlighted topics include but are not limited to:

1. **Integrity Challenges**
2. **Media:** Which forms of misconduct receive most attention? From which fields? How extensive do the media report on these cases?
3. **Deviance in Science:** What are motivations and drivers?
4. **Peer-review Processes:** How is quality control maintained in the face of current challenges? What is the role of the peer review system, which, according to many, is facing a crisis in its own right? Can journals play their role as gatekeepers and supervisor?
5. **Institutional Perspectives on Research Integrity:** Institutional response to misconduct - fair procedures?
6. **Conceptual Issues:** Important developments and policy regimes guidelines, ethical codes, and policy instruments
7. **Retractions**
8. **Legal Aspects of Misconduct:** Which is the role for law in the protection and promotion of research integrity? How to guarantee fair procedures for addressing scientific misconduct? Which are the current legal challenges for Europe in this area? And how do rules on research integrity and scientific misconduct interact with other existing legal frameworks, such as personal data protection?

Until November 2017, almost 70 abstracts were submitted and reviewed by a program committee:

- **Prof Dr Hub Zwart**, Professor of Philosophy at the Faculty of Science (Radboud University Nijmegen, SKU) and scientific director of the Centre for Society and the Life Sciences (CSG).
- **Dr Willem Halfman**, lecturer at the Institute for Science, Innovation, and Society, at the Radboud University, Nijmegen.
- **Prof. Dr Margit Sutrop**, Head of the Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, and the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at University of Tartu.
- **Prof. Dr Serge Gutwirth**, full Professor at Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Faculty of Law and Criminology and leading the multidisciplinary Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS) at VUB.
- **Prof. Dr Jenneke Christiaens**, full professor at the VUB's Faculty of Law and Criminology, member of the Criminology Department and chair of the Crime & Society Research Group at VUB.
- **Prof. Dr Gloria González Fuster**, research professor at Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB).
- **Dr Eric Breit**, senior researcher at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences.
- **Prof. Ruud ter Meulen**, Director/Chair at the Centre for Ethics in Medicine, University of Bristol.
- **Prof. Dr Massimiano Bucchi**, professor of Science and Technology in Society and of Science Communication, University of Trento.
- **Dr Thed van Leeuwen**, senior researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) of Leiden University.
- **Dr Sarah de Rijcke**, professor at CWTS of Leiden University.

Out of these papers, 56 papers were chosen as presentations in parallel sessions on February 5 and February 6, 28 papers each day. Members of the PRINTEGER team chaired the parallel sessions. Presentations should had a duration of 20 minutes, followed by short discussions. Eleven abstracts were taken into consideration as posters during the lunch break on day 2, seven posters were presented.



The main conference closed with the panel discussion entitled “The Next Steps: Joining Forces to Implement our Results and Promote a Supportive European Research Integrity Culture” on day 2, moderated by Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen).

### Panel Discussion Members

- **Dr. Isidoros Karatzas** (European Commission, DG Research & Innovation, Head of the Ethics and Research Integrity Sector)
- **Dr. Caroline Gans Combe** (INSECC, Senior Researcher)
- **Dr. Dirk Lanzerath** (German Reference Centre for Ethics in the Life Sciences (DRZE), Director)
- **Gareth O’Neill** (European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers, President)
- **Prof. Dr. Guy Widdershoven** (VU University Medical Center Amsterdam, Head of the Department of Medical Humanities)
- Moderator: Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)

On day 3, members of the consensus conference team met to finalise the consensus conference statement along with students trying-out the PRINTEGER tool “UPRIGHT” next door. Participation on day 3 was by invitation only.

## Programs of the PRINTEGER European Conference

DAY 1 – FEBRUARY 05, 2018



11:30-12:30 Registration and Opening with Coffee [AULA]				
12:30-13:00 Welcome Address Dr. Willem Halffman (Radboud University Nijmegen)				
Parallel Sessions				
Room	FESTSAAL	HS IV	HS V	HS VI
Topic	GOOD SCIENCE I Chair: Prof. Ruud ter Meulen University of Bristol	INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES I Chair: Dr. Eric Breit (Oslo Metropolitan University)	MISCONDUCT I Chair: Prof. Dr. Massimiano Bucchi (University of Trento)	INTEGRITY EDUCATION Chair: Andrea Reyes Elizondo (Leiden University)
13:15-13:45	Research Integrity as a new Battlefield for Concepts of good Science Willem Halffman (Radboud University Nijmegen) Barend van der Meulen (Rathenau Instituut)	The Irish National Forum on Research Integrity: A National Approach to Responsible Conduct of Research Jennifer Brennan (Technological Higher Education Association)	Rule-Breaking and Research Excellence Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences)	A Transformative Approach to Ethics Education Scott Howell (Seoul National University College of Law)
13:45-14:15	The Myth of Null-Hypothesis Testing Leonie van Grootel (VU University Amsterdam)	Unintended Consequences of Institutional Reform in Uzbekistan Minjung Cho (Leiden University)	Cases of Misconduct and Massmedia: The Romanian Case Maria Aluas (Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj-Napoca)	Tracing Integrity -The Institutionalisation of a Concept in Danish Higher Education Rachel Douglas-Jones (IT University of Copenhagen)
14:15-14:45	Research Integrity Challenges in Academia: A Qualitative Study of Researchers, Managers and Advisors Working in the European Economic Area (EEA) Mari-Rose Kennedy (University of Bristol)	Promoting Research Integrity Through Student Led Academic Integrity Movement: Evidence from Nepal Rebat Kumar Dhakal (Kathmandu University) Rupa Munakarmi (Kathmandu University) Kul Prasad Khanal (Kathmandu University) Sanjay Hamal (Kathmandu University)	From Research Integrity to Research Misconduct: Rites of Passage Tina Garani-Papadatos (National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece) Vasiliki Petousi (University of Crete)	How to Teach Scientific Integrity? Vincent Coumans (Radboud University Nijmegen)
Coffee Break [AULA]				
Topic	GOOD SCIENCE II Chair: Dr. Eric Breit (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences)	INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES II Chair: Prof. Dr. Gloria González Fuster (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)	INTEGRITY NARRATIVES Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)	INTEGRITY PRACTICES Chair: Prof. Dr. Serge Gutwirth (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)
15:15-15:45	Achieving Good Science – A Cross-Disciplinary Study Sonja Jerak-Zuiderent (University of Amsterdam) Jonna Brenninkmeijer (University of Amsterdam)	Promoting Integrity of Biomedical Research at Universities Mikyung Kim (Seoul National University College of Medicine)	The Shifting ‘Self’ in Discourses on the ‘Self-regulatory Capacities’ of Science. Investigating Narratives on who should care for Research Integrity Ulrike Felt (University of Vienna) Florentine Frantz (University of Vienna)	How to Engage the Whole Research Community in Writing of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity: Estonian Experience Margit Sutrop (University of Tartu)
15:45-16:15	Towards a Multiple-C Account of Scientific Integrity Jos Kole (Radboud University Medical Center)	Institutional Perspectives on Research Integrity in the Ukraine Universities: How the System pushes Misconduct Iryna Degtjarova (EURODOC)	The Completeness, Correctness and Depth of ‘On Being A Scientist’ Vincent Coumans (Radboud University Nijmegen)	Distinguishing between Incompetent Research and Research Misconduct Hugh Desmond (University of Leuven)
16:15-16:45	Policy Instruments: Insights from the EMBO Research Integrity Initiatives Sandra Bendiccioli (EMBO)	Retractions Originating from Countries after the Soviet Union Collapse Loreta Tauginiene (Mykolas Romeris University)	Tragedy of Collaboration: Collaboration as a Road to Misconduct? Justus Rathmann (University of Zurich) Heiko Rauhut (University of Zurich)	The Frequency of Scientific Plagiarism Measured by a Text Matching Software: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Vanja Pupovac (University of Rijeka)
16:45-17:15	Proxy Economics – A Transdisciplinary Theory of Competition with Imperfect Information Oliver Braganza (University of Bonn)	Success, Integrity, and Cultures in Academia: Voices of Belgian Researchers and Research Students Noémie Aubert Bonn (Hasselt University)	Research Integrity as a Part of Scientific Responsibility, Results from a Qualitative Interview Study with Natural Scientists Sebastian Wäscher (Institute of Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine Zurich)	Research Integrity at the Intersections in Interdisciplinary Collaborations Peter Lutz (University of Maastricht)
17:30 Conference Walking Dinner [AULA]				



DAY 2 – FEBRUARY 06, 2018

Registration and Opening with Coffee [AULA downstairs]				
09:00	Keynote [AULA] Dr. Maura Hiney (Health Research Board, Ireland & Chair of Science Europe Working Group on Research Integrity)			
Parallel Sessions				
Room	FESTSAAL	HS IV	HS V	HS VI
Topic	GOOD SCIENCE III Chair: Dr. Willem Halffman (Radboud University Nijmegen)	FRAUD Chair: Prof. Dr. Margit Sutrop (University of Tartu)	QUESTIONABLE RESEARCH PRACTICES Chair: Prof. Dr. Jenneke Christiaens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)	RESEARCH MISCONDUCT Chair: Dr. Thed van Leeuwen (Leiden University)
10:30-11:00	Scientists' Views and Understanding of Research Integrity and Research Misconduct Vasiliki Petousi (University of Crete) Eirini Sifaki (University of Crete) Tina Garani-Papadatos (National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece)	The Committee for Research Integrity: An Investigative Authority in Fraud Cases? Stefanie Van der Burght (Ghent University)	Making Sense of Questionable Research Practices Eric Breit (Oslo Metropolitan University)	Ghostbusting the Writer Academic. Ghostwriting in Germany – A Quantitative Study Tony Franky (University of Freiburg)
11:00-11:30	What is Research Integrity to Researchers? Key Issues from Conversations with Natural Scientists Sarah Davies (University of Copenhagen)	Visibility Concerns, Invisible Institutions and the Making of Misconduct Scandals Felicitas HeBelmann (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies) Martin Reinhardt (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)	The Role of 'Intention' in Real Life Cases of Research Misconduct Shila Abdi (KULeuven)	Fraud in Science. A Systematic Analysis of 'Retraction Watch' Data Jennifer Gewinner (ETH Zurich)
11:30-12:00	Mapping Normative Frameworks for Ethics and Integrity of Research (EnTIRE): Stakeholder Consultation Natalie Evans (VU University Medical Centre Amsterdam)	Scientific Misconduct: a Bibliometric Analysis of the Schön Case Marc Luwel (Leiden University)	Estimating the Number of Current Users of Questionable Research Practices: A Social Network Approach Nicholas W. Fox (Rutgers University)	Perceiving and Engaging in Research Misconduct*: Preliminary Results of DEFORM's on-line survey Georgia Koumoundourou (University of Crete) Vasiliki Petousi (University of Crete)
12:00-12:30	Academic Research Climate Amsterdam - A cross-sectional survey study Tamarinde Haven (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)	Organizational Influences on Research Misconduct: Insights from a Multinational Survey Ellen-Marie Forsberg (Oslo Metropolitan University)	Researching Scientific Deviance: on Academics, Honour and Doing Research Today Jenneke Christiaens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) Marijke Van Buggenhout (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)	How Researchers Perceive Research Misconduct and how they would Prevent it: A Qualitative Study in a Small Scientific Community Ivan Buljan (University of Split)
12:30-13:30 Lunch with Poster Exhibition [AULA]				
Topic	JOURNALS Chair: Dr. Sarah de Rijcke (Leiden University)	STRENGTHENING INTEGRITY Chair: Dr. Willem Halffman (Radboud University Nijmegen)	RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)	
13:30-14:00	Analysis of Scientific Fraud: Retracted Publications from the Scientific Literature Thed van Leeuwen (Leiden University)	Solving the Sharing Paradox - How Data Sharing can be promoted for the Benefit of Research Integrity Johannes Breuer (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)	Interactive Session: Does Competitive Research Funding Contribute to Questionable Research Practices? (Interactive Session 1) Stephanie Meirmans (Amsterdam Medical Center, University of Amsterdam) Gerben ter Riet (Amsterdam Medical Center, University of Amsterdam) <i>(Please note: own laptop, notebook or iPad required)</i>	Fostering Responsible Research: What can Journals do? (Interactive Session 2) Mario Malicki (University of Amsterdam) Gerben ter Riet (Amsterdam Medical Center, University of Amsterdam)
14:00-14:30	A Citation Context Analysis of Retracted Publications Marion Schmidt (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies)	How Ensuring Integrity Became Part of Peer Review's Responsibilities Serge Horbach (Radboud University Nijmegen)		

DAY 2 – FEBRUARY 06, 2018

14:30-15:00	Time Trends and Risk-Factors in Publication Bias Julia Jerke (University of Zurich)	Developing a Consensus Statement on Organisational Responsibilities for Good Research Integrity Ellen-Marie Forsberg (Oslo Metropolitan University) Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo Metropolitan University)	Optimizing the Responsible Researcher Govert Valkenburg (Leiden University) Joeri Tjebk (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)
15:00-15:30	Journals' Instructions to Authors in 2017: A Cross Sectional Study across all Disciplines Mario Malicki (University of Amsterdam)	Management Tools to Foster Integrity in Science Eva Giesen (Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale)	Bringing Habermas and MacIntyre Together? A Perspective on Science Ethics and Scientific Misconduct Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)
15:30-16:00 Coffee Break [AULA]			
16:00-16:45	Panel Discussion [AULA] 'The Next Steps: Joining Forces to Implement our Results and Promote a Supportive European Research Integrity Culture' Dr. Isidoros Karatzas (European Commission, DG Research & Innovation, Head of the Ethics and Research Integrity Sector) Dr. Caroline Gans Combe (INSECC, Senior Researcher) Dr. Dirk Lanzerath (German Reference Centre for Ethics in the Life Sciences (DRZE), Director) Gareth O'Neill (European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers, President) Prof. Dr. Guy Widdershoven (VU University Medical Center Amsterdam, Head of the Department of Medical Humanities) Moderator: Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)		
16:45	Draft Consensus Conference Statement Dr. Ellen-Marie Forsberg (Oslo Metropolitan University)		
17:00	Closing Remarks Dr. Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)		

DAY 3 – FEBRUARY 07, 2018

Registration and Opening with Coffee [FESTSAAL]			
Parallel Sessions			
Room	HS IV	HS V	SENATSSAAL
09:30-10:00	Keynote Gareth O'Neill (European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers, President)		
	HS IV	HS V	CONSENSUS CONFERENCE
10:00-12:00	TRY OUT OF TOOLS "UPRIGHT" * Please bring your notebook & headset		
12:00-13:00	Lunch [FESTSAAL]		
13:00-15:00	TRY OUT OF TOOLS "UPRIGHT" CONSENSUS CONFERENCE		





**Table 1**  
**Dissemination activities to promote the PRINTEGER European Conference.**

Channel	Name	Link	Reach-out
Twitter	PRINTEGER	We are happy to announce the @PRINTEGER European Conference on #ResearchIntegrity 2018 #RRI. Registration is open: <a href="https://printeger.eu/registration/">https://printeger.eu/registration/</a>	812 12 retweets
	Institut B Bioètica	05-07/2018 Call for Papers "PRINTEGER European Conference on Research Integrity" <a href="http://bit.ly/2vBOsaC">http://bit.ly/2vBOsaC</a> #bioeticalBB #IBBeacme2017	1867 follower
	HEIRRI Project	worth sharing! European Conference on #ResearchIntegrity 2018 #RRI Registration and call for papers: <a href="https://printeger.eu/conference2018/">https://printeger.eu/conference2018/</a> via @PRINTEGER	1032 follower
	SAGE	Why #research Integrity Matters to You. @PRINTEGER #conference #callforpaper <a href="https://sagepub.blogspot.it/2017/07/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you.html">https://sagepub.blogspot.it/2017/07/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you.html</a> ... #RRI	942 follower
	RRI Tools	New in the #RRI Toolkit @PRINTEGER - promoting #integrity as an integral dimension of #excellence in #research <a href="http://bit.ly/2tY6wyN">http://bit.ly/2tY6wyN</a>	2820 follower
	Research Integrity	@PRINTEGER has Call for Papers for upcoming European conference on research integrity <a href="http://ow.ly/sJcP30dOVcn">http://ow.ly/sJcP30dOVcn</a>	3 retweets
	LSTSblog	Why Research Integrity Matters to You', open call for papers @PRINTEGER <a href="https://vublst.wordpress.com/2017/09/13/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you/">https://vublst.wordpress.com/2017/09/13/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you/</a> ... deadline is 30 Sep 2017	416 follower
	Association E&I	@PRINTEGER European Conference on #ResearchIntegrity 2018 <a href="http://printeger.eu/conference2018/">http://printeger.eu/conference2018/</a>	34 follower
	Sarah de Rijcke	CfP for Research Integrity Conf 5-7 Feb 2018 <a href="https://printeger.eu/call-for-papers/">https://printeger.eu/call-for-papers/</a> ... #peerreview #retractions #institutions #RRI #misconduct @PRINTEGER	558 follower
	Bristol Uni Cem	Registration open for conference on #researchintegrity, involving @BristolEthics colleagues Mari & Ruud PRINTEGER <a href="https://printeger.eu/conference2018/">https://printeger.eu/conference2018/</a>	528 follower



<b>facebook</b>	UBO facebook page @unibonn	Rheinische Bonn	Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn	Bonn	42.794 likes (UBO page)
		<p>“To all researchers, young and early career scientists and research organizations out there: Why does research integrity matter to you?</p> <p>Let's discuss this and further related topics during the PRINTEGER European Conference on Research Integrity, February 05-07, 2018, in Bonn, Germany. Registration is open here: <a href="http://printeger.eu/registration/">http://printeger.eu/registration/</a>“</p>			
	STSTN - Scienza Tecnologia e Società	#callforpapers #researchintegrity Dal 5 al 7 febbraio a Bonn si terrà la conferenza conclusiva di PRINTEGER, il progetto sull'integrità della ricerca cui partecipa anche #STSTN. Deadline per le proposte 30 settembre 2017.			348 likes (STSTN page)
<b>Platforms</b>	Information and Documentation Centre on Ethics in Medicine (IDEM)	<a href="http://www.idem.uni-goettingen.de/aktuell/detailansicht/article/5-7-februar-2018-bonn.html">http://www.idem.uni-goettingen.de/aktuell/detailansicht/article/5-7-februar-2018-bonn.html</a>			
	SAGE - Public Understanding of Science	<a href="https://sagepubs.blogspot.de/2017/07/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you.html">https://sagepubs.blogspot.de/2017/07/why-research-integrity-matters-to-you.html</a>			
	GESIS - Centre of Excellence Women and Science	<a href="http://www.gesis.org/cews/news-events/call-for-papers/">http://www.gesis.org/cews/news-events/call-for-papers/</a>			
	University of Dusseldorf - Geistes-, Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften	<a href="http://www.hera.hhu.de/de/termine/terminkategorien/geistes-kultur-und-sozialwissenschaften-arts-and-humanities.html?tx_cal_controller%5Bgetdate%5D=20170917&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Bview%5D=list&amp;cHash=afc9f0a1bd1064bd6023d0ff97f07d12">http://www.hera.hhu.de/de/termine/terminkategorien/geistes-kultur-und-sozialwissenschaften-arts-and-humanities.html?tx_cal_controller%5Bgetdate%5D=20170917&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Bview%5D=list&amp;cHash=afc9f0a1bd1064bd6023d0ff97f07d12</a>			
	University of Dusseldorf - Lebenswissenschaften	<a href="http://www.hera.hhu.de/de/termine/terminkategorien/lebenswissenschaften-life-sciences.html?tx_cal_controller%5Bgetdate%5D=20171022&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Bview%5D=list&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Boffset%5D=1&amp;cHash=231de73b6fda2e57991e615a85459f81">http://www.hera.hhu.de/de/termine/terminkategorien/lebenswissenschaften-life-sciences.html?tx_cal_controller%5Bgetdate%5D=20171022&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Bview%5D=list&amp;tx_cal_controller%5Boffset%5D=1&amp;cHash=231de73b6fda2e57991e615a85459f81</a>			
	European Network for Academic Integrity	<a href="http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/events-calendar/">http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/events-calendar/</a>			
	HEIRRI Project facebook page	<a href="https://de-de.facebook.com/HEIRRI/">https://de-de.facebook.com/HEIRRI/</a>			
	Institut of Medical Ethics	<a href="http://www.instituteofmedicalethics.org/website/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=856:printeger-european-conference-on-research-integrity&amp;catid=55:international-events&amp;Itemid=36">http://www.instituteofmedicalethics.org/website/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=856:printeger-european-conference-on-research-integrity&amp;catid=55:international-events&amp;Itemid=36</a>			
	NCP/EU Office	<a href="http://www.eubuero.de/wg-aktuelles.htm">http://www.eubuero.de/wg-aktuelles.htm</a>			
	Website Willem Halfmann	<a href="https://halffman.org/2017/06/20/european-conference-on-research-integrity/">https://halffman.org/2017/06/20/european-conference-on-research-integrity/</a>			
	Enrio	<a href="http://www.enrio.eu/news-activities/printeger-european-conference-research-integrity-2018/">http://www.enrio.eu/news-activities/printeger-european-conference-research-integrity-2018/</a>			



	Eurodoc	<a href="http://eurodoc.net">http://eurodoc.net</a>	
	UBO Event homepage	<a href="https://www.uni-bonn.de/veranstaltungen/public-1513771277.72">https://www.uni-bonn.de/veranstaltungen/public-1513771277.72</a>	
<b>Invitations</b>	Mailing list UBO		~ 5.000 persons
	Mailing lists PRINTEGER Partners		n.n.
<b>Conferences</b>	EACME	Flyer	~ 800 participants
	SATORI final conference	Flyer	~ 300 participants
	WCRI2017	Flyer + online <a href="http://www.wcri2017.org/images/PRINTEGER_Conference-Flyer_final1.pdf">http://www.wcri2017.org/images/PRINTEGER_Conference-Flyer_final1.pdf</a>	~ 200 participants
<b>Distribution List</b>	NCP Science with and for Society Germany-Newsletter		
	NCP's Science with and for Society		
	International Newsletter City of Bonn	<p><b>“Why Research Integrity Matters to You! PRINTEGER European Conference on Research Integrity, February 05-07, 2018, Bonn.</b></p> <p>The EU project PRINTEGER invites researchers, academics and all interested parties for its final conference in Bonn. We will discuss aspects of research integrity from different points of view with you. The EU funded project aims at enhancing research integrity by promoting a research culture in which integrity is part and parcel of what it means to do excellent research. For further information visit us online: <a href="https://printeger.eu/conference2018/">https://printeger.eu/conference2018/</a>.”</p>	n.n.



## 5. - Day 1, February 5, 2018 -

### 5.1. Welcome Address – Dr. Willem Halffman

Willem Halffman set the stage for the common thread in the conference: the question of how to make research integrity a collective responsibility, rather than the responsibility of individual researchers. He did this by looking at the metaphor of elite sports that is often used in the current discourse about science.

### 5.2. Session on Good Science I - Chair: Prof. Ruud ter Meulen

#### Research Integrity as a new Battlefield for Concepts of Good Science

*Barend van der Meulen (Rathenau Institut)*  
*Willem Halffman (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

In this presentation, Barend van der Meulen (Rathenau Institut) presented the analysis of the development of “research integrity” as a new object of research management and professional concern. In the Netherlands, the Stapel case, soon followed by a few other major cases, has led to an increased attention for research integrity and a new “infrastructure” to manage the issue. As this infrastructure developed, it has become an arena for a growing number of issues. Originally, research integrity was strongly associated with scientific misconduct in terms of plagiarism, data fabrication and falsification, for which organizational and professional interests seem to converge. However, the notion of research integrity has become more unclear. One reason is the introduction of “questionable research practices” or QRP. Mr. van der Meulen focussed on the Netherlands, where after 2011 an infrastructure for managing research integrity rapidly emerged, including Scientific integrity committees, new codes of conduct, courses for PhDs, integrity officers, retraction practices, etc. Also a professional network on research integrity, NRIN, and a funding program for research integrity were set up. Some of these new practices, or revitalized practices, are embedded within the organizational structure of the university, supporting Boards to discipline university staff in cases of scientific misconduct. Others, like PhD courses by Graduate Schools can be understood as attempts to embed professional understandings of research integrity within the discipline.

#### What is Research Integrity and how can we Promote it? A qualitative Study of Researchers, Managers and Advisors Working in the European Economic Area (EEA)

*Mari-Rose Kennedy (University of Bristol)*  
*Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo Metropolitan University)*  
*Eric Breit (Oslo Metropolitan University)*  
*Külliki Seppel (University of Tartu)*  
*Margit Sutrop (University of Tartu)*  
*Ilaria Ampollini (University of Trento)*  
*Massimiano Bucchi (University of Trento)*  
*Ruud ter Meulen (University of Bristol)*



The presentation reported on some preliminary work from the synthesis stage of the study, to explore how participants understand research integrity and what they suggest is needed to help promote research integrity in the day-to-day practice of academic research.

The presenter reflected upon the preliminary findings presented to highlight key issues for consideration for policy makers and research organisations with regards to promoting research integrity. We will also make some recommendations about how the findings can contribute to the development of educational resources for researchers working in an academic environment.

### **The Myth of Null-Hypothesis Testing**

*Leonie van Grootel (VU University Amsterdam)*

Problem statement

Leonie van Grootel discussed how the widespread use of null hypothesis significance testing (NHST) threatens research integrity, because it can cause researchers to draw erroneous conclusions from their data. This research project has the goal to increase research integrity by creating awareness among researchers about the problems associated with NHST and to provide researchers with better alternatives for NHST. The aims of our study are to explore the views of scientists on the utilization of NHST in scientific research and to develop strategies to implement use of alternative methods for drawing conclusions from empirical data. The preliminary findings from the interviews and the focus groups were presented during the presentation. With the information from the interviews and the focus groups, the search conferences will be used to decide upon the desired alternatives for NHST, and to come up with strategies to implement these alternatives in research practice and educational programs.

## **5.3. Session on International Perspectives I – Chair: Dr. Eric Breit**

### **The Irish National Forum on Research Integrity: A National Approach to Responsible Conduct of Research**

*Jennifer Brennan (Technological Higher Education Association)*

Jennifer Brennan presented the advantages of a national approach to research integrity, highlighting the substantial progress that has been made since the Forum was established, such as producing national guidance on topics such as the role and responsibility of the Research Integrity Officer, managing investigations of research misconduct, and the interface between research ethics and research integrity. It also outlined how the Forum will facilitate the roll-out of a research integrity training programme in all Irish publically-funded research performing organisations. The presentation concluded with a discussion of the Forum's future plans for enhancement of responsible research conduct in Ireland.



## **Unintended Consequences of Institutional Reform in Uzbekistan– Closer Look at Publication Behavior for Academic Performance in Health Research Institutions**

*Minjung Cho (Leiden University)*

The purpose of the research presented by Minjung Cho was to examine the impact of institutional reforms on research performance and its output in relation to research integrity. The implemented policies are well intended, but the consequences of such reforms seem to have had little success in building a better-educated and better-trained cadre of researchers.

The results from both quantitative and qualitative analysis revealed the unintended outcomes. For instance, more than 43% (140/321) of the publications in the health sector had Uzbek authors as corresponding authors, which implies great progress in the field. However, most of the publications were in low impact factor journals mainly published in Russia. Moreover, a growing trend showed that researchers were publishing in journals with less strict or non-existent peer review processes.

Mrs. Cho concluded that the new policy reforms of the Uzbekistan's higher education need to consider the caveats of existing established practices that would require long term planning. There are systematic multi-level factors in the structure of the health research system that limit research performance as well as limiting the changes needed to take place as part of policy reform. A more objective criteria and better guidelines need to be set to ensure research integrity for future research performance of Uzbekistan.

## **Promoting Research Integrity Through Student Led Academic Integrity Movement: Evidence From Nepal**

*Rebat Kumar Dhakal (Kathmandu University)*

*Rupa Munakarmi (Kathmandu University)*

*Kul Prasad Khanal (Kathmandu University)*

*Sanjay Hamal (Kathmandu University)*

The paper presented investigates how Nepali universities are promoting research integrity and preventing research misconduct across their campuses. The presenters argued that research integrity is not something enforced by the university; rather it is a culture of collective scholarly awareness that needs to be cultivated across academia. Moreover, the facilitative role of the university leaders in developing integrity indicators and thereby also institutionalizing those indicators as part of university response to research ethics resulted in a robust university-wide framework for promoting the core values of academic integrity (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility) among its students and faculty. They concluded that research integrity matters – it matters most in academia – and thus, research institutions and higher education institutions, especially those where research integrity is often taken for granted, need to develop a strong framework for conducting and evaluating research, no matter who initiates this movement.



## 5.4. Session on Misconduct I- Chair: Prof. Dr. Massimiano Bucchi

### Rule-Breaking and Research Excellence

*Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo Metropolitan Universit)*

In his presentation, Knut Jørgen Vie argued that rule-breaking is sometimes a necessary part of promoting excellence in science. Today, the consensus is that falsification, fabrication and plagiarism are among the worst infringements of scientific integrity, and this has been formalized in many policy documents and codes of conduct. While these kinds of activities are indefensible in almost all cases, there are a few examples of exceptions to these rules. Accepting that even our best rules in research integrity can have exceptions should have consequences for how we approach the codification of research integrity and ethics, and for the systems we construct for ensuring compliance to these codes. The presenter argued that we need flexibility in how rules are enforced and formulated.

### Cases of Misconduct and Massmedia: The Romanian Case

*Maria Aluas (Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj-Napoca)*

In her presentation, Maria Aluas followed the question of the relationship between Media and Research. In the last decade, in Romania media reported hundreds of misconduct cases. It was for the first time in the history when people heard about misconduct, especially about plagiarism and conflict of interests. Mass media has fulfilled its role of informing by presenting numerous cases of misconduct from different areas: politics, academics, and sports. As objectives of her presentation she set up the following: presenting the Romanian cases of research misconduct reported by media; analysing the consequences of these cases for the academic community, students, and society; identifying causes and possible solutions in order to promote integrity of researchers and trust in science. Mrs. Aluas concluded is that researchers and academics need to be more aware about the danger and bad consequences of these practices for the next generations of students and researchers. Even if media insists on solutions, in terms of mandatory regulations (legal or academic), her concerns are that it is not enough. In order to correct and prevent such practices, we need to teach and educate students and academic community on these topics and to search together for solutions. Also, ethicists should have more visibility in the university curricula and to provide students with good examples, good practices, and to support them in their projects and activities.

### From Research Integrity to Research Misconduct: Rites of Passage

*Tina Garani-Papadatos (University of Crete)*

*Vasiliki Petousi (University of Crete)*

The author's presentation aimed to safeguard the conceptual and definitional background of integrity as a fundamental primary concept and to demonstrate that this passage should keep the importance and necessity of this ancestry, this relation between the deviant behavior and the violated principle. It is only by acknowledging the continuation of this kinship that the proper organization of the scientific community can be maintained and the proper status can be bestowed



to it, the presenters stated. Thus, the ancestral value of integrity should be seen as part of the effort to govern research misconduct. It is only after the researcher has gained the knowledge of what has to be preserved that regulations, even tools and measurement methods can be developed in a complementary and supportive manner, for their value is not denied; in many cultures the combination of the horizontal and the vertical can contribute to achieving balance and regaining a faith lost, for ignoring the foundations enhances instability and weakens a previously revered situation such as the status of the scientific community that regulations seek to preserve.

## 5.5. Session on Integrity Education - Chair: Andrea Reyes Elizondo (Leiden University)

### A Transformative Approach to Ethics Education

*Scott J. Howell (Seoul National University College of Law)*

In his presentation, Scott Howell presented how he examined the ways in which our traditional approach to ethics education necessarily fails to protect the profession from the many nefarious incentives scientists face throughout their careers. Then, moving on from the traditional approach, the replacement approach he suggests involves three main steps:

1. Cover less
2. Engage more
3. Build community

The goal is to help them build identities and values that will be impervious to the incentives that threaten to undermine scientific integrity. This new educational approach, combined with the best technical and systemic solutions, is the way forward toward more trustworthy scientific results.

### Tracing Integrity -The Institutionalisation of a Concept in Danish Higher Education

*Rachel Douglas-Jones (IT University of Copenhagen)*

*Lise Degn (IT University of Copenhagen)*

*Laura Louise Sarauw (IT University of Copenhagen)*

*Sue Wright (IT University of Copenhagen)*

*Jakob Williams Ørberg (IT University of Copenhagen)*

This presentation showed material from a current research project based in Denmark, the aim of which is to ethnographically follow the 2014 Danish Code of Research Integrity into university doctoral training settings, and work long-term with PhD candidates as they reason about its relevance and applicability to their own research settings. The first half of the presentation presented the results of desk work tracing research integrity through international policy in order to contextualise the Danish Code of Research Integrity within the broader global initiatives and place its institutionalisation within the Danish ecology of universities and university colleges. From this, the presenters put forward three distinct threads within integrity's account of itself: its focus on the



trustworthiness of science, its cultivation of environments and cultures of integrity within sites of research, and the kinds of ideal researchers it seeks to generate for the future. The second half of the presentation described the research design and early stage findings of our ethnographic study, focused on the PhD training courses for four different faculties at a single Danish university. This analysis developed into a preliminary overview of doctoral and early career subjectivities, with a focus on how we will follow the questions arising in training sessions through interview and observational work during 2018.

### How to Teach Scientific Integrity?

*Vincent Coumans (Radboud University Nijmegen, Institute for Science in Society)*

*Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen, Institute for Science in Society)*

*Hub Zwart (Radboud University Nijmegen, Institute for Science in Society)*

This presentation started with a reflection on desirable properties of an educational tool. Secondly, a strength-weakness analysis of several existing tools was presented. This analysis was based on the previously determined framework of desired properties. Subsequently, the results of the feedback-loops were presented, focusing on the different versions of the tool and how the feedback lead to modifications. They concluded with an overview of a prototype of the educational tool. After the conference, it will take several additional feedback-loops to develop the definitive version of the tool.

## 5.6. Session on Good Science II – Chair: Dr. Eric Breit

### Achieving Good Science – A Cross-Disciplinary Study

*Sonja Jerak-Zuiderent (University of Amsterdam)*

*Jonna Brenninkmeijer (University of Amsterdam)*

*Amade M'Charek (University of Amsterdam)*

*Jeannette Pols (University of Amsterdam)*

In their project the authors suggest that it is important to attend to what goes well within a range of disciplines and that we otherwise might risk losing with a singularizing focus on what goes wrong. They aim to specify, first, how 'goods' emerge in everyday practices within the different disciplines; second, how they are at stake, through what kind of frictions and dilemmas and third, what kind of innovative and creative solutions have been developed to prevent destructive tendencies; like for example, departmental focus on collaboration amongst scientists in order to ward off competitive tendencies outside the department. Relying on first interviews, one focus group discussion and first observations in these fields they came up with some preliminary findings on how scientists try to achieve the 'good' in their daily scientific work. In this way, they aimed to specify how more general concerns, for example, on competition, interdisciplinary research, or data-management, play out in the respective disciplines. This might contribute to a vocabulary that helps to develop and sustain the



'goods' in the different scientific disciplines not in absolute and generalizing terms, but rather as everyday responsible research practices.

### **Towards a Multiple-C account of Scientific Integrity**

*Jos Kole (Radboud University Medical Center)*

In his presentation, Mr. Kole demonstrated his objective: to develop a conceptual framework of scientific integrity – called a Multiple-C approach – that does justice to its many dimensions in order to enable new integrative research about scientific integrity and stimulate innovative education to foster scientific integrity. The methods presented may be called 'conceptual analysis' and 'philosophical argument'. He concluded that the concept of scientific integrity needs a Multiple-C approach in order to do justice to its multiple dimensions. Connections between the diverse correlating concepts reveal new research questions and educational strategies.

### **Policy Instruments: Insights from the EMBO Research Integrity Initiatives**

*Sandra Bendiscioli (EMBO)*

This presentation reported on their observations from the discussions at the research integrity workshops and from the comments of the participants regarding the online course. A summary of some of the concrete actions taken at the host institutes will be presented. As an international organization that promotes excellence in the life sciences and represents an elected membership of more than 1700 leading scientists, EMBO supports scientists at different stages of their careers, funds scientific courses and workshops, and publishes scientific journals. A major goal of the organization is to create an environment where scientists can work according to the highest scientific standards and principles of research integrity.

The workshop discussions and some of the comments on the online course have highlighted a general lack of awareness of what constitutes responsible conduct, particularly with respect to laboratory work, and of the consequences of inappropriate lab practices. This probably reflects the heterogeneity of guidelines on research integrity within and between European countries, or the lack thereof entirely. But at the same time, and more importantly, the workshops showed that there is a desire and eagerness to discuss dilemmas and uncertainties in scientific research and to implement institutional measures to support scientists to acquire and use the skills necessary to follow the highest scientific standards in their daily work.

### **Proxy Economics – A Transdisciplinary Theory of Competition with Imperfect Information**

*Oliver Braganza (University of Bonn)*

In many areas of society we rely on competition to better achieve societal goals. Ideally, competition motivates effort and directs resource allocation. However, due to imperfect information, competition generally relies on quantitative proxy measures in order to assess performance. This leads to an increasing use of such quantitative 'proxies' in modern societies. Unfortunately, we lack a unified theory on the basis of which to assess such claims, perhaps because such a theory cannot be formulated within traditional disciplinary boundaries. Here, the presenter developed an



interdisciplinary theory of ‘proxy economics’. Oliver Braganza proposed that any proxy measure in a competitive societal system becomes a target for the competing individuals (or groups). Several psychological aspects can be deduced directly from the concept of proxy based competition. Together, these psychological properties are likely to give rise to ‘bounded ethicality’.

## 5.7. Session on International Perspectives II – Chair: Prof. Dr. Gloria González Fuster

### Promoting Integrity of Biomedical Research at Universities

*Mikyung Kim (Seoul National University College of Medicine)*

Mrs. Kim emphasized in her presentation that biomedical research is in crisis worldwide—from common methods that fail to generate reproducible results, to rampant research misconduct. The crisis has its roots in a variety of factors originating from the levels of researchers, research institutions, and industry. Universities, which have the highest stake in research integrity to fulfill their missions in education and research in relation to industry, should take the initiative to rectify the crisis with a collective, holistic approach targeting all three levels at once.

### Institutional Perspectives on Research Integrity in the Ukraine Universities: How the System pushes Misconduct

*Iryna Degtyarova (EURODOC)*

Iryna Degtyarova started her presentation by outlining, that individual and collegial dimensions consider personal/interpersonal relations and lie in the field of ethics and moral qualities of an individual or a group of individuals. But the systemic or institutional level must ensure the proper framework for protection and promotion of academic integrity. But what if the practice in higher education and science creates the conditions which push misconduct instead? The presenter demonstrated an empirical analysis of the HE practices in Ukraine (based on the law and institutional culture). She showed, that there is a number of conditions which push researchers to violate integrity principles. Mrs. Degtyarova concluded that these factors could be considered as a checklist for self-evaluation of the institutions when they strive to implement integrity practices. Institutional conditions must correlate with integrity measures and encourage all academic community to follow ethical principles.

### Retractions Originating from Countries after the Soviet Union Collapse

*Loreta Tauginiene (Mykolas Romeris University)*

Loreta Tauginiene stated that retractions as one of the major mechanism of science self-correction are increasing annually at high speed. However, there is no evidence regarding countries that regained their independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union and that accessed the digitalization of science through international databases foremost and national and institutional requirements to publish in journals indexed in Scopus, Clarivate Analytics and/or other international research databases. This presentation gave a short overview of retracted papers published by researchers from these countries. Summing up, it is assumed that flawed works are underreported and different databases demonstrate different statistics of retractions. Furthermore, to encourage



reporting flawed works necessitates finding local ‘ambassadors’ and empowering governmental bodies to unravel how many papers are originally in researcher’s mother tongue or English, if papers are published in the latter. This has potential to predict the number of papers likely to be retracted in the future; therefore, further investigation is needed, she concluded.

### **Success, Integrity, and Cultures in Academia: Voices of Belgian Researchers and Research Students**

*Noemie Aubert Bonn (Hasselt University)*

*Wim Pinxten (Hasselt University)*

The project presented attempts to explore existing conflicts between research integrity and attributions of success in academia. They concluded that better understanding where good research practices conflict with attributions of success and career advancements is essential to initiate a sustainable change to promote integrity in research. The current investigation, which aims to obtain insights from researchers and research students, is the first step of a broader research project in which we will compare such perceptions to those of different research actors, such as funders, university administration, and editors. Identifying conflicting expectations and understand where research actors differ in their interpretation of research excellence will better equip us to align success expectations with integrity and to build realistic and sustainable approaches to inherently fosters integrity in research.

## **5.8. Session on Integrity Narratives – Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli**

### **The Shifting “Self” in Discourses on the “Self-regulatory Capacities” of Science. Investigating Narratives on who should care for Research Integrity**

*Ulrike Felt (University of Vienna)*

*Florentine Frantz (University of Vienna)*

Over the last decade we witnessed a growing concern over issues of research integrity within contemporary research systems. This presentation contributed to an understanding of this phenomenon through looking at the shifting ideas of who should be active in caring for research integrity. To do so, the team investigated the debates around research integrity (in its widest sense) in two of the leading science journals Science and Nature from the 1980ies to today.

The paper presented build on research undertaken in the framework of the project “Borderlands of good scientific practice” funded by the Research Fund of the Austrian National Bank (PI: Ulrike Felt) and carried out at the research platform “Responsible Research and Innovation in Academic Practice” at the University of Vienna. It uses a body of articles published on issues of research integrity in Science and Nature between 1980 and 2017. In our analysis we embrace a narrative approach and look into the ways in which articles around transgressions of research integrity are constructed, the plots they follow, the recurrent elements they use and the valuation practices they perform.



### **The Completeness, Correctness and Depth of ‘On Being A Scientist’**

*Vincent Coumans (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

*Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

*Hub Zwart (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

This presentation started with a summary of the film ‘On Being A Scientist’ in which the presenter also identifies several themes and claims regarding scientific integrity as displayed in the film. Subsequently, the methods and preliminary results were shown regarding the completeness, correctness and depth of the film. They concluded the presentation with the analysis of some interesting themes from the film.

### **Tragedy of Collaboration: Collaboration as a Road to Misconduct?**

*Justus Rathmann (University of Zurich)*

*Heiko Rauhut (University of Zurich)*

The presenters examined the influence of the size of the research team, operationalised by number of co-authors of a given article, on the probability of a retraction as an indicator for the researcher’s integrity.

### **Research Integrity as a Part of Scientific Responsibility. Results from a Qualitative Interview Study with Natural Scientists**

*Sebastian Wäscher (Institute of Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine Zurich)*

*Anna Deplazes Zemp (Institute of Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine Zurich)*

*Nikola Biller – Andorno (Institute of Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine Zurich)*

The presenters stated that to entirely understand the moral ideals determining the ethical expectations towards scientists, research integrity should be embedded in a broader concept of scientific responsibility which also includes ethical attitudes, principles, and rules, relevant outside of the scientific system. In their study they conducted semi-structured qualitative expert interviews with senior scientists and engineers from various disciplines, like biology, chemistry, physics, or biological engineering. The guiding question was: “Who is responsible to inform which parts of the society about which aspects of research under which normative premises?” First results show that the interviewed scientists focus strongly on various aspects of research integrity as their perspective on responsibility. In contrast, aspects of social responsibility are either discussed implicitly or rather briefly. With the help of the responsibility framework presented above and the statements of the interviewees, a complex set of aspects of scientific responsibility will be carved out. To illustrate these considerations one task expected from scientists, presenting their scientific work to the public, will serve as an example.



## 5.9. Session on Integrity Practices – Chair: Prof. Dr. Serge Gutwirth

### How to Engage the Whole Research Community in Writing of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity: Estonian Experience

*Margit Sutrop (University of Tartu)*

The aim of this paper presentation was to elaborate on the challenges of engaging all the research institutions of the country in writing and implementing of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity.

The Code of Conduct for Research Integrity was meant to complement the Code of Ethics of Estonian Scientists adopted in 2002. Differently from the Code of Ethics for Estonian Researchers, the current document describes both individual researchers' and research institutions' responsibilities. Therefore, it was especially important that the Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Agreement was signed namely by research institutions.

Before signing the agreement, Estonian research and development institutions finalized the content of the Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity during a national feedback round. During two rounds of consultations more than 150 suggestions for improvement were made. Lively response and heated discussion on some issues showed that different research disciplines and research institutions may have different understandings of what is considered to be acceptable and what is not.

In this presentation it was outlined where the main disagreements and points of discussion arose and how consensus was reached among the research community. It will also be described how the further implementation of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity is planned

### Distinguishing between Incompetent Research and Research Misconduct

*Hugh Desmond (KULeuven)*

*Kris Dierickx (KULeuven)*

In the presented paper the authors first identify two common frameworks and argue that these either face the problems of operationalizability and implementation, or are excessively broad. They then proposed a new framework that analyses the distinction in terms of scientific methodology. As alternative they proposed the 'methodology framework'. Instead of defining misconduct as a behaviour or an intention, it should be defined as a biased methodology that can only be explained by the motivations researchers often have for misconduct, such as personal gain etc. Incompetence, by contrast, is a faulty methodology. The difference between misconduct and incompetence is that the methodological errors in the former are systematic and consistent, suggesting that the errors are not a mere coincidence. Thus misconduct can be established by a thorough analysis of the methodology followed by a researcher.

### The Frequency of Scientific Plagiarism Measured by a Text Matching Software: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

*Vanja Pupovac (University of Rijeka)*

The aim of the presentation was to assess the frequency and characteristics of plagiarism in a scientific community with purpose to incite discussion about definition of plagiarism and measures to



prevent plagiarism. A systematic review of published scientific studies that detect the frequency of plagiarism in scientific articles using text matching software is conducted. The results indicate high rates of plagiarism in scientific papers and absence of a unified process to determine plagiarism in a scientific article. Statistically lower frequency of plagiarism is estimated in studies that identify plagiarism using more than three criteria than in studies that use three or less than three criteria. Although authors agree that extent of similar text is the first criterion for defining plagiarism, they cannot agree on an amount of a similar text that indicates plagiarism and how to interpret additional criteria such as originality of similar text.

### **Research Integrity at the Intersections in Interdisciplinary Collaborations**

*Peter Lutz (Maastricht University)*

*Bart Penders (Maastricht University)*

In this presentation, they reported from an on-going study of different operationalisations of integrity in practice, and the ways in which actual collaborations deal with them. They considered how interdisciplinary scientific collaborations shape articulations and research integrity practices as well as how these deal with the pluralities of good science they host. Their research takes a constructivist approach, acknowledging that alternatives exist alongside one another, and tracing definitions and articulations of research integrity as they emerge from practices rather than impose them. The on-going empirical analysis focuses on how tacit norms for responsible research shape research practices in concrete dialogue with more explicit guidelines and how they influence the design, conduct, and (e)valuation of collaborative research.



## 6. - Day 2, February 6, 2018 -

### 6.1. Keynote Speech: Fostering a Culture of Research Integrity: The Contribution of Policy as an Agent of Change

*Dr. Maura Hiney (Health Research Board Ireland)*

Dr. Maura Hiney from the Health Research Board Ireland, opened day 2 with a keynote speech on the contribution of policy as an agent of change.

Dr. Hiney pointed out that academia is not alone: “There is a crisis of trust in public institutions – the political system, the policing system and industry. Loss of trust is not good for anyone, and most especially for science, since public funding is dependent on public trust. To add to this, funding agencies are becoming increasingly concerned about research waste that is rendered worthless by poorly conceived design and inadequate methodology, lack of reporting of clinical trials outcomes and how we might tackle the so-called reproducibility crisis in research. Up to 40% of clinical trials data unreported or reported inadequately - Missing data about adverse events particularly dangerous and misleading data about benefits can lead to futile health system costs.

It is no longer acceptable to believe or argue that science can regulate itself, because this is clearly not the case. Retraction and errata might shore up the scientific record, but the problem is that

- Retraction of faulty data can take 22-79 months or longer in which time flawed clinical studies can accrue a significant number of patients.
- In addition, retracted articles live on in the literature. 75% of retracted articles in MEDLINE (1973-2010) still available on non-publisher websites
- And of course, retracted articles can still have an impact in on the field even after retraction  
E.g. impact of Wakefield study on levels of MMR vaccination still persists

Can policy-driven initiatives contribute to behaviour change at either an institutional or individual level? That question is hard to answer for research integrity, so Maura looked around for other spheres in which policy is used as a tool for change. Problems in public health are often tackled at a policy level by imposing something – for example a sugar tax, increasing the unit price of alcohol or in the case of smoking, imposing a ban on smoking in the workplace. The hoped for behaviour change was smoking cessation. There was certainly a high compliance with the ban and the BMJ study indicated that the ban encouraged people to quit or at least reduce the number of cigarettes smoked daily. This was also observed in a comparative study with other European countries who also introduced smoking bans. So, the smoking ban as a public health initiative was successful in that it improved the environment, had positive health benefits more generally and resulted in higher levels of smoking cessation or reduction in level of consumption in continuing smokers.”

Maura concluded that actions need to happen across all dimensions:

- “Advocate for legal national frameworks for research integrity.
- Promote institutional policies and structures to handle allegations of misconduct (and check compliance).
- Put the emphasis on training and mentoring of younger researchers and work on harmonised curricula.



- Promote publication practices than enhance transparency – publication of negative results, access to all background data, open access and open data policies as part of our T&C.
- Explore ways to remove perverse incentives – put the emphasis on quality, not quantity; examine models of funding.
- Encourage an institutional culture of integrity.

However there is no silver bullet: Like research ethics, which has been on the policy agenda for much longer, research integrity needs to become absorbed into the thinking of researchers and the institutions that employ them, as an integral way of practicing their business.

Rather than resisting policy-driven initiatives as idealistic aspirations that hamstringing already pressured individuals, they need to be seen as useful tools in the armoury of the research community.”

## 6.2. Session on Good Science III – Chair: Dr. Willem Halfman

### Scientists’ Views and Understanding of Research Integrity and Research Misconduct

*Vassiliki Petousi (University of Crete)*

*Eirini Sifaki (University of Crete)*

*Tina Garani-Papadatos (University of Crete)*

Presenters demonstrated research as part of the HORIZON2020 funded research program DEFORM: Determine the global and financial impact of research misconduct. The team argued in their presentation that the emergence of a new type of research that is characterized by its practical relevance, project-like nature and transdisciplinary, which is the inclusion of the knowledge spread across a range of very different actors, marks a new relationship between science, politics and the general public. To respond to this epistemological challenge, in the project they first attempted to fully describe the phenomenon through quantitative, descriptive accounts of the extent and characteristics of scientific articles published in peer reviewed journals, through discourse analysis of selected scholarly journals and expert interviews. Interviews focused on participants’ views of research misconduct and integrity in research, broadly defined, the extent of the phenomenon, its impact, significance and suggestions for potential solutions. All in all, scientists discourse reflect on one hand their personal views and perspectives impregnated in the specific research culture, professional experience and institutional practices but are also inscribed into historical and ideological realms of different countries.

### What is Research Integrity to Researchers? Key Issues from Conversations with Natural Scientists

*Sarah Davies (University of Copenhagen)*

The presentation grounded in a qualitative interview study, carried out in Denmark in 2017, that explored natural scientists’ experiences of enculturation into scientific practice, their career histories, and their ideas about research integrity and ethical research more generally. One focal point was international mobility, in order to explore whether enculturation happens differently in different national locations. Two issues were particularly key to their conceptions of research integrity and of the ethics of scientific practice. Intense competition, the treatment of junior researchers, insecurity of employment, the scientific reward system and gender inequity were all cited as dynamics that



nurtured poor research, deliberate or otherwise, while simultaneously being ethically problematic in and of themselves.

### **Mapping Normative Frameworks for Ethics and Integrity of Research (EnTIRE): Stakeholder Consultation**

*Natalie Evans (EnTIRE)*

What are the views of researchers, publishers, funding organisations, RE+RI experts and other stakeholders about relevant normative frameworks, and what are their needs for information? The H2020 funded EnTIRE project entails a stakeholder consultation in all European countries in order to identify experiences in practice. The results of the stakeholder consultation will be used to create a dynamic online Wiki-platform, owned by the RE+RI community, that will make the normative frameworks governing RE+RI accessible. The platform development takes an iterative, 'bottom up' participatory approach, focusing on the RE+RI issues of most concern to stakeholders, practical experience with norms, regulations and guidelines, available resources, and existing best practices.

In this presentation, the preliminary results from the stakeholder consultation in Spain, Croatia, and the Netherlands were described. In particular, participants' informational support needs, identified from an exploration of their experiences in practice, are defined. Also, first evaluations of the EnTIRE platform were presented. Similarities and differences between countries and how these will be reflected on the platform are also discussed.

## **6.3. Session on Fraud – Chair: Dr. Sven-Erik Mamelund**

### **The Committee for Research Integrity: An Investigative Authority in Fraud Cases?**

*Stefanie Van der Burght (Ghent University)*

This presentation reflected on five years of experience as a secretary of the CRI at Ghent University. On average, two cases per year were handled. Some containing one or multiple minor breaches, others dealing with major fraud, from disputes on co-authorship rules to data fabrication. Looking back on the file progression of each of these cases, it is clear that there are still a lot of growing pains that could improve the entity of a CRI as such and the operational features in particular. However, this experience has also led to some critical questions. After a short introduction on the constellation and procedure of the CRI at Ghent University, the presenters discussed the questions mentioned above from their own personal experience as a Research Integrity Advisor and secretary of a CRI. With this critical look at the current constellation of CRI, they aimed at contributing to the theoretical framework of responding to research fraud and give a realistic approach to the topic.



## Visibility Concerns, Invisible Institutions and the Making of Misconduct Scandals

*Felicitas Heßelmann (Humboldt University Berlin)*

*Martin Reinhart (Humboldt University zu Berlin)*

The contribution looked at the structures established to detect and sanction scientific misconduct, especially at the effects of stigmatization, scandals, and public shaming they often produce. Looking at the institutional processes that precede scandalization and shame penalties, they asked how this outcome relates to existing regimes and configurations of visibility and larger symbolic structures. They aimed to show how visibility features as a central concern and structuring element throughout this system.

## Organizational Influences on Research Misconduct: Insights from a Multinational Survey

*Svenn-Erik Mamelund (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences)*

*Eric Breit (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences)*

*Ellen-Marie Forsberg (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences)*

The aim of the paper presented was to add to the (early) conceptual assumptions by empirically exploring hypotheses about organisational factors influencing research misconduct. Based on a review of the literature on organisational misconduct, they hypothesize that the following factors will be positively related to misconduct: (a) work satisfaction, (b) identification with the values of the workplace, (c) workplace socialization, (d) managerial emphasis, (e) availability of information, (f) provision of courses or arenas of discussion, (g) conflicts of interests, and (g) workplace pressure. In the paper, they tested these hypotheses doing multivariate analysis on unique survey data from 8 institutions across 7 European countries (N=1126) and control for variables including age, gender, education, scientific field, academic position, and experience.

## 6.4. Session on Questionable Research Practices - Chair: Prof. Dr. Jenneke Christiaens

### Making Sense of Questionable Research Practices

*Eric Breit (Oslo Metropolitan University)*

In this paper presentation Eric Breit explored how researchers make sense of questionable research practices. While much attention has focused the phenomenon of scientific misconduct, often conceptualized as instances of fabrication, falsification and plagiarism, considerably less is known of how they largely “grey” and contested area of questionable research practices (ref) is given meaning to in and through researchers’ experiences. Empirically, he drew on qualitative data collected as part of a cross-national survey sent out to academic members of eight universities in Europe. Given the sensitive nature of this phenomenon, this qualitative data provides potentially rich empirical insights into its manifestation in research life. At the same time, the fact that the data collection has been structured and not face to face also raises interesting methodological questions.



In the analysis he focused on some central experiential processes: Identification (articulating a specific activity as misconduct), reaction (attempt of handling the misconduct), and retrospective experience (reflections on outcomes and own actions). These have partially been developed prior to the survey, and have thus guided the responses. Within these overall categories, Eric conducted a grounded analysis and inductively theorize on the central elements in researchers' sensemaking processes regarding scientific misconduct.

### **The Role of "Intention" in Real Life Cases of Research Misconduct**

*Shila Abdi(KU Leuven)*

Within the national guidelines in Europe on research integrity and research misconduct, a remarkable discrepancy can be found about whether "intention" should be considered as a key factor for defining a practice as misconduct. Consequently, due to the lack of consistency in those guidance similar forms of misconduct risk to be judged differently. No research has been done on the criteria used in judging similar cases of research misconduct. Therefore, a thorough investigation of the role attributed to "intention" when dealing with research misconduct cases is essential. For this study 11 European countries were selected, representing the three levels of regulation of investigation of research misconduct: *local commissions*, *national advisory commissions* and *national commissions with legal mandate*. During the session, the results of data analysis (the role of "intention") and survey were presented. Also, with the results of our research, we could enter the discussion with the revised edition of the '*European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*' (2017), where the rule to demonstrate that misconduct was committed intentionally, knowingly or recklessly, is no more required.

### **Estimating the Number of Current Users of Questionable Research Practices: A Social Network Approach**

*Nicholas W. Fox (Rutgers University)*

Mr. Fox demonstrated a new tool to estimate the number of researchers using questionable research practices. As interventions such as preregistration, publication badges, and registered reports are put into place, social network scale-up can be used longitudinally to measure the effect of those interventions on the population of QRP users. If interventions are curbing QRP use, subsequent estimates should reflect this decrease. Although the current work will only generate a prevalence estimate for American psychologists, the replication crisis is bound neither by country nor by field. This work is an important first step to better understand how many scientists use questionable research practices, and further work will serve to expand geographic and academic scope.

### **Researching Scientific Deviance: on Academics, Honour and doing Research Today**

*Jenneke Christiaens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)*

*Marijke Van Buggenhout (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)*

In this paper presentation the results of the PRINTEGER research on the incidence of scientific misconduct was demonstrated. Despite the rising academic and public attention for scientific fraud, adequate knowledge on the prevalence and understanding of misconduct in science is still



unsatisfactory. First, the difficult measurement the incidence of scientific misconduct was discussed. Beyond conceptual and methodological problems, several other issues are complicating the measurement of misconduct in scientific practices, such as official procedures, dark number, reporting attitudes of researchers, etc. Second they will shortly discussed diverse and lacking registration practices that could be observed when collecting data from institutions in partner countries.

## 6.5. Session on Research Misconduct – Chair: Dr. Thed van Leeuwen

### Ghostbusting the Writer Academic. Ghostwriting in Germany – A Quantitative Study

*Tony Franzky (University of Freiburg)*

*Fabian Bross (University of Stuttgart)*

*Fabian Dirscherl (University of Stuttgart)*

Beside fabrication, falsification and plagiarism, academic ghostwriting is one of the main issues on research on academic integrity. In these cases, unmasking and verifying the real author is one of the most difficult challenges. Methods of forensic linguistics are considered as effortful and not very reliable, because of comparatively small corpora for comparison and less dependability in cases of peer-ghostwriter-longterm-maintenance. The authors attempt to close the research gap on ghostwriting utilization: It was possible for them to extract the public available online auctions of a huge German ghostwriting online agency and analyze this data in respect of questions like the quantitative demand of ghostwriting ordered by areas of study, qualitative and quantitative extent of ghostwriting and affected levels of qualification. The first data analysis showed, that the number of ghostwriting is increasing since release of the platform. On basis of these highly comprehensive and diverse datasets (about 30.000 sets), it was possible to start a quantitative analysis with underlying qualitative aspects to give evidence about ghostwriting in Germany. Especially educational background of ghostwriters, types of requests for writing jobs, periods of time for fulfilling ghostwriting jobs, scientific background and level of qualification of customers and few other aspects. The work in hand will show focus areas on ghostwriting and ghostwriters as well as ghostwriting demands and how they are fulfilled and will give a brief insight on the ghostwriting market in Germany.

### Fraud in Science. A Systematic Analysis of “Retraction Watch” Data

*Jennifer Gewinner (ETH Zurich)*

The total number of retractions increases and so does the number of retractions due to scientific misconduct. It seems what once happened behind closed doors of universities is now dragged into the open where the media eagerly awaits the next scientific misconduct scandal. One of these media outlets is the blog “Retraction Watch”. Initiated in August 2010 it resumes until today, reporting on retracted papers and their background stories, always with the aim to find the true cause of retraction, trying to draw the line between scientific mistakes and scientific misconduct. A content analysis of retraction notices plus the background information given in the “Retraction Watch” blog is



yielding a unique information set, as until now, either retraction notices have been analyzed in great numbers but without adding further explanatory information or only a small number of very specific cases of scientific fraud have been analyzed. Data collection is now in progress and is counting already 379 analyzed cases of retractions, marking the middle of the data collection process. Once completed, the data will be analyzed in order to explain the various causes of retraction and the detection of possible temporary trends. Already one can see that the so far collected data replicate the finding that retractions vary depending on geographic origins and the journals' impact factors]. It remains to be seen whether the data can also replicate the findings where not only the retractions in number are increasing, but also the time to retraction span increases too.

### **Perceiving and Engaging in Research Misconduct": Preliminary Results of DEFORM's on-line Survey**

*Georgia Koumoundourou (University of Crete)*

*Vassiliki Petousi (University of Crete)*

*Ioannis Tsaousis (University of Crete)*

Putting all theoretical frameworks and research findings together with their limitations and literature gaps identified, the goal of the presented survey is to provide, using an international and interdisciplinary sample of researchers employed in both the academia and industry, an updated estimation of their perceived severity, their perceived prevalence and their actual involvement in an extended list of research practices deviating from research integrity. Finally, the survey aims at identifying researchers' reactions when faced with RM in their working environment, the potential causes (both individual and situational) of the phenomenon, and the perceived impact accompanying RM. Data were collected via an online survey questionnaire developed for the purposes of this study and analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Preliminary results were presented and theoretical as well as practical implications for both, science and society, were discussed.

### **How Researchers Perceive Research Misconduct and how they would Prevent it: A Qualitative Study in a Small Scientific Community**

*Ivan Buljan (University of Split School of Medicine, Split)*

*Lana Barać (University of Split School of Medicine, Split)*

*Ana Marušić (University of Split School of Medicine, Split)*

The aim of the presented study was to use a qualitative approach to explore the potential motivations and drivers for unethical behaviours and determine the role of institutions regarding those issues in a small scientific community setting. Three focus groups were held, two with doctoral students and one with active senior researchers. Three main topics were derived from the focus groups discussions. Based on the results of our study, research misconduct in a small scientific community is perceived to be the consequence of the interaction of several social and psychological factors. Possible improvements should be systematic, aiming both for improvements in work environment and personal awareness in research ethics, and those changes should be implemented in research institutions.



## 6.6. Session on Journals – Chair: Dr. Sarah de Rijcke

### Analysis of Scientific Fraud: Retracted Publications from the Scientific Literature

*Theo van Leeuwen (Leiden University)*

*M. Luwel, L.J van der Wurff, A. Reyes-Elizondo, & S. de Rijcke*

The authors presented a comprehensive analysis of all retracted papers published in journals processed for WoS. Next to the causes for retraction as well as the initiators of retraction, they showed the general trends of retracted literature in the WoS database. They focused on a geographical distribution of retracted scientific literature, and contextualize that against the national global positioning of the countries involved. A final analysis focuses on the distribution of retracted literature over domains of scientific activity. Together, these analyses can show the relationship between the penetration of research metrics in the national science system, and the way that works out in the behavior of scientists in those national contexts, by concentrating on the existence of funding mechanisms based upon research performance measurement. Within the set of retracted publications we identified a considerable number (co)authored by a small number of researchers or institutes. We will concentrate on these specific cases as well.

### A Citation Context Analysis of Retracted Publications

*Marion Schmidt (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies)*

The presentation focused on schema and intermediary findings a the citation context analysis. Publications are being formally retracted – that is declared invalid by way of a short notice by publishers, authors or others – as a consequence to proven failures of research integrity like fabrication, falsification, plagiarism but as well honest error. The presented (research-in-progress) work addressed the question of how scientific communities deal with problematic validity, the status of retracted publications and if and how the contents of these publications are subsequently used. The core of the analysis is the distinction between essential, methodical, and peripheral knowledge claims for each paper. The analysis was based on a corpus of interlinked retractions and retracted publication which Marion Schmidt delineated previously in PubMed and Web of Science by way of matching and retrieval methods.

### Time Trends and Risk-Factors in Publication Bias

*Julia Jerke (University of Zurich)*

The objective of the presented study was twofold. First, it several factors potentially influencing the magnitude of publication bias such as author group size, number of citations as a proxy for originality, explicit vs. implicit hypotheses, experiment vs. field study and funding were examined. Second, a time trend was investigated. Data was collected from all volumes of the Quarterly Journal of Economics, one of the leading economics journals, published between 1960 and 2015. The sample consists of all quantitative articles reporting empirical studies. To test for publication bias the authors screened these articles thereby extracting z- or t-values, respectively and subsequently analyse their distribution at the common levels of significance. Spanning over a timeframe of more fifty years this study is unique in presenting the longest time trend of publication bias.



## Journals' Instructions to Authors in 2017: A Cross Sectional Study across all Disciplines

*Mario Malicki (University of Amsterdam)*

The objective of the presented study was to analyse instructions to authors (ItA) of scientific journals across all scientific fields regarding transparency and openness of reporting, as well as peer review practices. The design was a cross-sectional study of journals' instructions to authors and journals' scopes, collected from the journals' websites, stored as text files and analysed using a combination of manual checking and data extraction using regular expression matching through Perl. The goal was to compare differences between the major scientific areas and multidisciplinary journals. They used Scopus database to generate a random probability sample of journals belonging to the Life Sciences, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, Health Sciences, Arts and Humanities and the category of multidisciplinary journals. Additionally, to determine the possible influence of journal prestige they divided the journals based on the SNIP (source normalized impact factor) terciles. Sample size was calculated based on the journals belonging to each category, and using an 8% margin of error.

## 6.7. Session on Strengthening Integrity – Chair: Dr. Willem Halffman

### Solving the Sharing Paradox - How Data Sharing can be promoted for the Benefit of Research Integrity

*Johannes Breuer (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)*

The sharing of research data is not only at the core of the idea and ideals of open science, but also an important means for ensuring research integrity. To allow for science to be self-correcting it is necessary that data are available to other researchers. In addition, as most research at European universities and research institutes is publicly funded, there also is an ethical obligation to make research data publicly available. Many granting organizations, including the European Commission, have recognized this and now have requirements or at least recommendations for data sharing. However, while the push for data sharing and open science in general as well as the number of available repositories, tools, and guidelines have been growing over the last few years, the availability of research data is still very limited in many fields.

### How Ensuring Integrity became Part of Peer Review's Responsibilities

*Serge Horbach (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

In their talk presenters described the historic emergence of peer review's current formats. They reviewed the scientific literature on peer-review and added recent developments based on information from editors and publishers. They analysed the rationale for developing new formats and discuss how they have been implemented in the current academic publishing system. They paid detailed attention to the emergence of the expectation that peer review can maintain 'the integrity of the science's published record' and how this influenced the design of the peer review system. They demonstrated that this leads to tensions within the current academic debate about both the responsibility and the ability of the peer review system to detect fraudulent and erroneous



research. They argued that these tensions demand for further discussion on the role of the peer reviewer within the review process.

### Developing a Consensus Statement on Organisational Responsibilities for Good Research Integrity

*Ellen-Marie Forsberg (Oslo Metropolitan University)*

*Knut Jørgen Vie (Oslo Metropolitan University)*

In this session the presenters presented the draft consensus statement in order to take into account any input from a broader audience before the statement will be finalised on the last day of the conference. (see separate chapter for this).

### Management Tools to Foster Integrity in Science

*Eva Giesen (Institut National de la Santé Et de la Recherche Médicale)*

Although some cases of fraud and plagiarism have been reported from the early days of science on the awareness of the necessity of scientific integrity has increased over the last 10 to 15 years and reasons and causes of undue behavior have been analyzed. Corrective actions in the case of fraud are taken by institutions and guides of conduct (Singapore statement, for example) are available.

Preventive actions at the level of a research team or the individual researcher, however, are more rarely been discussed in the literature, although neither charters nor guidelines for Research integrity will automatically change human habits. The change of habit has to be brought about by researchers themselves and accompanied by the management of the laboratory. We, the Réseau Inserm Qualité, have developed the concept of “Fair and efficient research management” (Ferm), which offers concepts and tools in laboratory management and thus helps put research integrity standards into practice. (Int. J. Metrol. Qual. Eng 6, (2015)). As part of a management system, research integrity is turned from an implicit understanding into an explicit rule in the lab. Ferm uses management tools to address specific principles of research integrity, such as project management, quality management, knowledge management.

The laboratory starts out with a Ferm declaration which states specific aims to attain in order to make sure that it will benefit from the attention, professionalism and management tools available in the lab. The PDCA (plan do check act) tool consists in planning, running, improving and documenting of actions. When identified as a process of management (process oriented approach), research integrity is declined into attainable objectives, which are followed by specific actions, checks and improvements. It can also be included into other processes. For example information on Good scientific Practice, What to do in case of suspicion of deviant behavior, Lab books, property of data, and authorship can be part of the process “Integration of a new co-worker”. The process “Departure” includes checks of the lab-books, check-list and time-table for transmission of information, biological samples and other tools. Record keeping, safety and completeness of raw data, results and additional scientific information are part of the documentation system of the lab, such as done in ISO 9001 quality management. With Ferm, a top-down architecture of data recording is created when preparing the publication of a research project in order to help track down figures and tables to raw data rapidly and safely. As a process, or part of a process, principles and responsibilities of research integrity will be part of the management of the lab and benefit from ISO 9001 requirements, Ferm-concepts and the regular attention which is given to all other processes the lab runs.



## 6.8. Session on Responsible Research - Chair: Dr. Luca Consoli

### Interactive Session: Does Competitive Research Funding Contribute to Questionable Research Practices? (Interactive Session 1)

*Stephanie Meirmans (Amsterdam Medical Center, University of Amsterdam)*

*Gerben ter Riet (Amsterdam Medical Center, University of Amsterdam)*

In this session, the presenters invited participants to actively take part in the quest towards investigating these issues. What is your view on the connections between competitive research funding and questionable research practices? What is the view of other participants of this conference on this issue? MeetingSphere™ digital tools was used to create a highly interactive atmosphere of knowledge transfer and integration in order to investigate how conference participants view this topic. The results of this session were directly fed into the ongoing project on this topic and created avenues for asking active researchers more targeted questions around this topic in a similar setting. Ultimately, the results of the project were to be presented to representatives of funding agencies as well as other relevant stakeholders.

### Fostering Responsible Research: What can Journals do? (Interactive Session 2)

Participants were invited to another discussion session: Future of scholarly communication which was facilitated using MeetingSphere software, which guarantees anonymity and also allow reflecting on opinions online after the discussion.

The topics were:

1. How do you envision the future of peer review?
2. How do you envision the structure of the scientific article in the future?

### Optimizing the Responsible Researcher

*Govert Valkenburg (Leiden University)*

*Joeri Tjink (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)*

The project Optimizing the Responsible Researcher aims to articulate received ideals of responsible research and responsible researchers, and compare these to the systems of recruitment, assessment and promotion of biomedical researchers. These systems will be studied through the lens of cultural analysis, focusing on how ideals circulate in research practices, how they become (transformed and) codified into rules and regulations, and how individual researchers in turn make sense of what these rules and regulations seem to demand from them.

In this presentation, preliminary insights from empirical research were discussed into both questions: what ideals of responsible research are held, and what kind of ideal seems to emerge *de facto* from policies regarding recruitment, assessment and promotion. Also, it was discussed how we envision mapping these insights on the group-grid framework.



## Bringing Habermas and MacIntyre together? A Perspective on Science Ethics and Scientific Misconduct

*Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

Can discourse ethics provide the ‘practical tools’ that virtue ethics need? Virtue ethical approaches to science ethics are a promising way to avoid the conceptual and practical pitfalls of rule-based or consequences-based models. On the one hand, putting too much emphasis on rules and regulations can lead to codes that are not followed because they are perceived by the intended target (the practicing scientists) as unrealistic, artificial and externally imposed. On the other hand, looking mainly at consequences can lead to ‘penalty-based’ approaches, where punishing bad behavior is more prominent than rewarding the practicing of ‘good science’. Virtue ethics offer a third way, in which the intrinsic motivation to be both a good scientist and a good person as individual are inextricably intertwined with the communal aspect of science (being part of a community of like-minded practitioners), and institutional (external) goals can be analyzed separately from the moral (internal) goals of the community.

In the present contribution Luca Consoli took the first conceptual steps towards a possible answer to these concerns, by bringing the conceptual frameworks of two authors together (MacIntyre and Habermas) who are usually considered as incompatible, if not antithetic.

## 6.9. Panel Discussion: “The Next Steps: Joining Forces to Implement our Results and Promote a Supportive European Research Integrity Culture”

The conference was close with a panel discussion on future directions for research integrity, with perspectives from both research and policy, moderated by Luca Consoli (ISIS, Radboud University). The participants reflected on research integrity as collective responsibility and discussed options for future research integrity policies.

Participants were: Dr. Isidoros Karatzas (European Commission, DG Research & Innovation, Head of the Ethics and Research Integrity Sector), Dr. Caroline Gans Combe (INSECC, Senior Researcher), Dr. Dirk Lanzerath (German Reference Centre for Ethics in the Life Sciences (DRZE), Director), Gareth O’Neill (European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers, President), Prof. Dr. Guy Widdershoven (VU University Medical Center Amsterdam, Head of the Department of Medical Humanities)



## 7. - Day 3, February 7, 2018 -

### 7.1. Consensus Conference: Working with Research Integrity – Guidance for Research Performing Organisations: The Bonn PRINTEGER Statement

All European Academies (ALLEA) has issued a European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-ethics\\_code-of-conduct\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-ethics_code-of-conduct_en.pdf). This is a very helpful and important document outlining principles for research integrity, descriptions of good research practices and advice on how to deal with violations of research integrity.

The ALLEA code includes advice to organisations, for instance:

- Research institutions and organisations should promote awareness and ensure a prevailing culture of research integrity.
- Research institutions and organisations should demonstrate leadership in providing clear policies and procedures on good research practice and the transparent and proper handling of violations.
- Research institutions and organisations should ensure that researchers receive rigorous training in research design, methodology and analysis.
- Research institutions and organisations should develop appropriate and adequate training in ethics and research integrity and ensure that all concerned are made aware of the relevant codes and regulations.

In the PRINTEGER project we experience that there is a need for more concrete guidance for organisations' work with research integrity, and we therefore seek to develop a consensus statement for how organisations can work with research integrity in practice. The focus is on operationalising institutional responsibilities in terms of training, monitoring, culture building, etc. We take a work-floor perspective, taking into account the daily challenges and organisational contexts most researchers are faced with, in line with the survey and focus groups conducted in the PRINTEGER project. The statement will make research integrity challenges recognisable and realistic from the work-floor perspective and will provide concrete advice for organisational actions to strengthen integrity. The target audience is research leaders and managers responsible for building good structures and cultures for research integrity in their organisations. The statement will be disseminated through PRINTEGER's network, newsletter and webpages and will be sent to targeted scientific and popular journals.

A consensus conference traditionally gathers together a broad range of experts who discuss in a deliberative process in order to reach a consensus on a given policy or scientific issue. There are several versions of the consensus conference concept. Common is the deliberative processes that leads to a consensus statement. This can be done in a physical meeting over several days. In our version, the consensus process was carried out as two rounds of email consultations (a so-called Delphi process) and one day of finalising the discussions, at the PRINTEGER European Conference on Research Integrity day 3.

The result of the Consensus Conference, the Bonn PRINTEGER Statement and all signatories are publicly available on the PRINTEGER website: <https://printeger.eu/bonn-printeger-statement/>.



## 7.2. UPRIGHT – Try-out of Tools with Students

### Keynote Speech: “Research Integrity for Early-Career Researchers”

*Gareth O’Neill (European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers)*

Gareth O’Neill, president at the European Council of Doctoral Candidates and Junior Researchers, welcomed all participants of the UPRIGHT tool try-out in his welcome speech.

### Try-out of Tools with Students

*Luca Consoli (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

*Vincent Coumans (Radboud University Nijmegen)*

After the keynote speech by Gareth O’Neill, the group of students was divided into two groups. One group tested UPRIGHT in a classroom context with live discussions and debate, the other group tested UPRIGHT individually as a standalone tool. The classroom group used the tool in order to facilitate group discussion and concrete information on specific topics was provided during these discussions. For the other group, the content was provided through course modules on UPRIGHT and discussions were performed through the built-in forums and poll questions.

Both groups first watched a significant part of the film by Leiden University, ‘On Being A Scientist’ and discussed the follow-up material provided in UPRIGHT. The streaming did not function as optimal as desired, but that was satisfactorily dealt with on-site and this issue is taken into account during the further development of UPRIGHT. Then several information modules were treated (either in the group context or individually). Lastly, several dilemmas, including dilemmas from the “Dilemma Game. Professionalism and Integrity in Research” as developed by the Erasmus University Rotterdam, were addressed through poll questions and discussion (again, either in the group context or individually, i.e. on the forum).

Afterwards both groups received a survey to assess the quality of UPRIGHT and to indicate on what facets UPRIGHT can be improved. In general the students were very positive on the tool, but they saw points for improvement as well. The student turn up for the try-out was a little lower than expected. However, several participants of the conference also joined the try-out, some of them having experience in providing integrity education. This led to detailed feedback from possible teaching-users of UPRIGHT. Furthermore, Gareth O’Neill participated as well in the try-out as well as researchers from other parts of the world, including Seoul.

The feedback received during the Bonn try-out has led to an update of the UPRIGHT prototype, which will be tested in further try-outs.