

"Researchers comply with their codes and regulations"! (ECoC 2017, p.6)

Description and background

This learning unit:

Introduces researchers to codes and regulations in their discipline

Enables an understanding of compliance and of potential complications

Challenges researchers to demand compliance in research

Emphasises how to switch to help mechanisms when an open and transparent dialogue about rules is not possible

Role Model

Keywords

Openness and Transparency; Research Integrity Offices; Persons of Trust in Research Integrity; Impartiality, Objectivity, Confidentiality

This unit has been prepared for interdisciplinary learning groups.

Learning Objectives

- Refer to codes and regulations
- **2** Discuss the rules of your discipline in an open and transparent manner
- **3** Acknowledge conditions for a research integrity dialogue

Learning Stages

- Introduce the topic
- *Immerse yourself in rules relevant to your discipline*
- **?** Engage in role play
- Reflect on conditions for a research integrity dialogue



"Quote about Safeguards"

This project receives funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 824488.





1 Introduce the topic:

Y3 Path 2 Integrity

Homework (before the unit starts) or reading session

Find what you view to be the most important code of research conduct within your discipline. Read it and bring it with you. Find a case of misconduct that happened in your discipline and bring a short description of it with you.

Immerse in research integrity rules:

Read or recall together Hannah's story and briefly flesh out what happened in the conferencing meeting. In pairs, take out the research rule that you chose from your code of research conduct. Imagine that your partner is Hannah. Explain to them the rule that you chose, and why it is the most important research integrity rule within your discipline is. Swap roles!

3 Engage in role play

2

Come together in a plenum. Greet everybody by shaking hands and introducing yourself. Pick two volunteers to engage in an improvised rotatory role play in which Researcher A uses their important research integrity rule.

Researcher A Asks Researcher B to follow the research integrity rule Audience raises their hand every time Researcher A or B uses aggressive behaviour

Every time the audience raises their hand, the actor should stop and ask the audience for a rational argument for why they should follow the Research Integrity Rule. The actor should then continue the play using the argument from the audience. If two others are voluntarily up for this task, play again!

Research Integrity Offices

Research Integrity Offices handle allegations of misconduct by obtaining expert opinions, statements and hearings. They are an impartial and confidential body to evaluate responsible conduct of research in a professional manner.

Research misconduct cases can also be directed to Research Integrity offices.

Divide your class into 5 groups. Assign each group a position in the play.

Person Z's group decides which misconduct case will be discussed in the upcoming role play and outlines the case in bullet points on the chalk board or flip-chart. Each groups should take 15 minutes to prepare their role and to decide who will act in the play. Send your actor into the play with bullet points or a written text!

Individual or Institution played by 1 person

presents a short, detailed case of Person Z's research misconduct

Person Z

played by 1 person

makes a statement defending their action to ignore the rules of Research Integrity

Research Integrity Office

represented by three independent experts from different disciplines (if possible, *Ombudsperson 1* should be in the same discipline as *Person Z*, and *Ombudsperson 2* should be in an affiliated discipline. *Ombudsperson 3* may be from another discipline).

0	mk	buc	lsp	ers	102	า 1
_						

makes a statement about why this case is a misconduct case; refers to rules, regulations and

codes of conduct*.

Ombudsperson 2

makes a statement about the severity of the case Ombudsperson 3

makes a statement about the importance of research integrity.

outlines possible impacts of the case.

* If this statement receives no approval from the audience, discuss in the plenum why objectivity is difficult in this case and then move on to the next case.

4 Reflect:

Come together as a class. Discuss when to reach out for help from people and entities in charge of enforcing research integrity, such as persons of trust (in research integrity), ombudspersons, and/or ethics committees. Together, come up with 3 rules on when it is time to find help! Write them in your notebook.

Seven Reasons to Care about Integrity in Research

- 1 Research Integrity Safeguards the Foundations of Science and Scholarship
- 2 Research Integrity Maintains Public Confidence in Researchers and Research Evidence
- 3 Research Integrity Underpins Continued Public Investment in Research
- 4 Research Integrity Protects the Reputation and Careers of Researchers
- 5 Research Integrity Prevents Adverse Impact on Patients and the Public
- 6 Research Integrity Promotes Economic Advancement
- 7 Research Integrity Prevents Avoidable Waste of Resources

(see Science Europe Working Group on Research Integrity – Task Group Knowledge Growth, 2015, Seven Reasons to Care about Integrity in Research)

